



Presbytery

Thomas Michael Loomer

INDIAN HISTORY / 1840

1850

THE HISTORY OF

THE

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

TWO ADDRESSES:

ONE,

TO THE GENTLEMEN

OF WHITBY,

WHO SIGNED THE REQUISITION, CALLING A MEETING
TO ADDRESS THE QUEEN, ON THE LATE (SO
CALLED) AGGRESSION OF THE POPE:

AND THE OTHER, TO

THE PROTESTANT CLERGY.

BY

The Catholic Priest of Ugthorp.

“I would you had been there to see
How the light blazed up so gloriously.”

“And then in naked majesty,
With brow serene, and beaming placid light,
Came truth.”

WHITBY:

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY HORNE AND RICHARDSON:
SOLD BY RICHARDSON & SONS, LONDON AND DERBY.

ONE SHILLING.

1851.

DEDICATION.

*The following pages are humbly, and gratefully Dedicated, to
the Catholic Noblemen and Gentlemen of Yorkshire, by the
Catholic Priest at Ugthorp.*

NOBLEMEN AND GENTLEMEN,

Many of you, lately appeared boldly, and manfully on the platform at York, in defence of our holy religion. Conscious of the justice and innocence of our cause, you feared neither the sneers, nor the insults, nor the shouts, nor the threats of its enemies, but, like your illustrious ancestors, shewed that you considered your religion, as your best inheritance, and held it more dear than life itself; whilst, on the other hand, like your illustrious ancestors, you shewed that you yielded to none, in your loyal allegiance to your temporal sovereign, and to the state. Now it would be ungrateful, nay even base, in us Catholic clergymen, not to second your manly, and zealous exertions in defence of our ancient, and holy faith. To you, therefore, I most humbly, and gratefully dedicate the following pages. I hope you will find, that I have not advanced in them, anything that is inconsistent with the principles of truth, of justice, and of honour. To have acted otherwise, would, I am sure (for I have the honour to be personally acquainted with most of you), be most insulting to your noble, and liberal feelings, and would only have served, to confirm the hostility of the Protestant, and to loosen the attachment of the Catholic, to that cause, which I had undertaken to defend.

Noblemen, and Gentlemen, when the Catholic looks back on the *past*, he will learn to hope well of the *future*. He will observe, that the irritating objections of former times, are now almost shamed out of Parliament, and can hardly support their credit, even among the most suspicious, and least informed Protestants. He will see, that our opponents have uniformly been compelled, to shift their

ground from position to position, and after pertinaciously defending each, have ended by abandoning *it*, and retreating to *another*. At first, the Catholics were accused of favouring the claims of the Stuarts, but the extinction of that family, has put an end to that charge. We were then told, that the Catholics, could not be bound *by oath*, though *oaths*, had been wisely devised as the *best safeguards*, against their supposed perfidy. Next, the fathers of the great Council of Latern, were marshalled against us ; as if men were to be punished at the *present* day, because Protestants will not understand the regulations of feudal Princes, and feudal Prelates *six centuries ago*. Afterwards, we were reproached with the deposing powers, and temporal pretensions of the Pope ; these were set at rest at *that time* (and we had hoped *for ever*,) by the answers of the foreign Universities. Lastly, came the Coronation Oath, men, however, could not be persuaded that the Sovereign, by promising to maintain the liberties of the Protestant Church, was bound to deprive of their civil rights all those, who might dissent from the spiritual creed of that Church. Each of these arguments in its day, was deemed *unanswerable*, but *each* has *yielded to discussion*. *Past* advantages, therefore, Noblemen and Gentlemen, are an earnest to the Catholic of *future* success ; and after the hour of the late excitement, about the Pope's temporal and spiritual power, has passed away, I am sure, all sensible, and unbiassed Englishmen will see, that the late hubbub, has been an *ignus fatuus* of imaginations distorted with fear, and alarm, which had well nigh, misled the whole nation, into a quagmire of inconsistency, illiberality and revolution.

Catholic Chapel House, Ugthorp, near Whitby,
January 21st, 1851.

TO THE READER.

READER, that you may the better understand the two following addresses, you ought *first*, to read the copy of the requisition for the meeting, &c., which is placed before these two addresses, and you ought also, to read the little address which here follows, and which I published to announce, that the following pages would shortly appear in print. In the notice of the requisition for the public meeting, &c., you will find these words, “extraordinary and presumptuous movement on the part of the Pope.” Now, reader, you must remember, that these memorable words are my grand text, in the two following addresses. I here beg to offer my sincere thanks to the gentlemen, who signed the requisition, for I am sure, if they had studied from the deluge until now, they could not have given me, a more suitable text for the Catholic cause, and a more destructive one to the Protestant Church. But, reader, you will be able to judge of this yourself, after reading the following pages. Read first then, the following little address, and then read the notice calling the public meeting.

In the press, and in the course of a few weeks will be published, an Address to the Gentlemen who signed the late Requisition to the Magistrates of Whitby, to call a Public Meeting to address the Queen on the late extraordinary and presumptuous movement on the part of the Bishop of Rome.

TO THE INHABITANTS OF WHITBY AND OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD.

INHABITANTS,

I have been lately often asked, why I did not attend the above meeting? I reply, read my address when it is published, and you will there find an answer to your question. It is a common observation of sailors, “only give the ship plenty of sea-room in a storm, and then she will live.” Now, inhabitants of Whitby, and of the neighbourhood, if you will give the Catholic Church (or, if you please, the Roman Catholic Church) only the sea-room of fair play, you will, perhaps, find that the bottom and sides of this spiritual ship, are well coppered with the solid, and impenetrable metal of good reasons, and solid arguments, and that, full rigged as she is, with the sails of truth, of justice, and of honour, she can gallantly brave the hurricanes of her enemies, and ride triumphantly, amid the storms of spiritual and temporal agitation, which have lately threatened to shipwreck, and to sink her.

When my address appears, I hope you will find in it, nothing that is inconsistent with principles of truth, of justice, and of honour. To have used any other weapons of defence would, in my humble opinion, have served only to strengthen the Protestant hostility, and to loosen the Catholic attachment, to that cause, which I had

undertaken to defend. You will, of course, expect a little of the comic, as coming from my pen, well, as the poet says,

Ridentum dicere verum
Quid vetat ?

Or, that I may not speak in a foreign tongue, "What forbids us to tell the truth, with a smile?"

Of course you will perhaps expect a little innocent stir, among the Reverends in my address, and *perhaps*, you may not be mistaken. If you remember, an *illuminated* Cambridge Divine, some years ago, came to Lythe, to make an "extraordinary and presumptuous movement" on the consciences of us Romanists, (as he politely styled us), and learnedly informed us, that we Romanists, were a set of spiritual chickens just hatching, and that he came to break our spiritual shells, that he might save the young birds, from being thrown into the scorching flames of Purgatory in the next world, but while the courteous Clerk, was performing this charitable office, to the benighted Romanists, *he, himself*, unfortunately, even in this world, fell into the flames of purgatory, which on this side the grave are made to burn, for those who bear false witness, against their neighbour; and it is generally believed, that he has never as yet been able to raise, from public opinion, as much money as will free him, from those torturing purgatorial flames. Oh, but you will naturally say, this is an old song, what has it to do with the present subject? Why, it has a great deal to do with it. Certain Reverends have been lately telling you, that the Pope of Rome, has just made a most "extraordinary and presumptuous movement," on the Protestants of England. Now you will perhaps find, from my Address, when published, that even *these* very Reverends themselves have been making, for a long time, a most "extraordinary and presumptuous movement" on the pockets and on the intellects of Englishmen; and have thus, like the *illuminated* Cambridge divine, unfortunately fallen into the very pit, which they have been so very charitably, and officiously digging for the *poor* Pope.

Sensible Englishmen, when these Reverends, would uncharitably excite you against your long much injured, and unjustly abused Catholic fellow creatures, just say to them, "Reverend gentlemen, you tell us that the Scripture (the book of eternal life and of truth), teaches CHARITY TO ALL MEN! why, therefore, should you wish us to exclude the *Catholics* from a share of that *universal* Charity?" And in the next place tell them, "the Pope and all his spiritual crew are either from God or not: if they are not from God, all their human, and popish inventions will come of themselves to naught, and why, therefore, should you wish us Protestants, to break our charitable heads about *them*. But if they are from God, how can either you or we fight against them, unless you arrogantly presume, that you can conquer the Almighty! At least, so teaches the sacred Scripture, for does it not thus plainly, and emphatically

say, ' And now therefore I say to you, refrain from these men, and let them alone, for if this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to naught ; but if it be of God, you cannot overthrow it, lest perhaps you be found even to fight against God.' " (Acts v. 38, 39.)

As I have been obliged to range in my address, over an extensive *spiritual* and *temporal* moor, and as I have had to bring down, and bag so much black game, of course my Address, will be of rather an extensive nature. It is, indeed, now in the press, but of course its appearance will, in some measure, depend upon the expedition of the printer, but I will promise you, that it shall be got out of the printer's hands *as soon as possible*, and then, it must appeal to the judgments of sensible and unbiassed minds, as to its merits, and demerits. In the mean time, as Englishmen always wish to know the text, I will give you the two texts, which I have chosen for the titlepage of my Address.

" I would you had been there to see
How the light blazed up so gloriously."

" And then in naked Majesty,
With brow serene, and beaming placid light,
Came truth."

Inhabitants, in conclusion, I confidently appeal to you, if you ever knew me do an ungentle act to any Protestant in point of religion. I have always wished equal rights and equal justice for all, both for Protestants and Dissenters ; I have always wished to live in peace and charity with all ; in short, I have always endeavoured to observe, as far as my human weakness would allow, that heavenly precept of our divine Saviour, " By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love for one another ;" and I can confidently appeal to the public, if this has not always been the tenor of my conduct. I assure you, that it is very contrary to my wishes, to have to appear before you, with my pen on these occasions. Among the Protestants I have many sincere friends, and of course, what I shall have to advance in my Address, may not be very agreeable to their feelings. But as I really know, and conscientiously believe, that the Church, of which I have the honour to be a minister, is really the true Church of Christ, to shrink from its defence for the sake of private feelings, and private interests, would, in my ideas, be a most base and an unchristian act on my part. I exclaim with the poet,

" A day, an hour of virtuous liberty,
Is worth a whole eternity in bondage."

Farewell, inhabitants, for the present, and if, when my Address appears before the public, you would like to have a little *innocent* merriment, and to hear some plain homely truths, I hope you will not be disappointed if you purchase my Address.

Catholic Chapel, Ugthorp, Dec. 21st, 1850.

COPY OF A NOTICE

*To the Worshipful the Magistrates for the Division of Whitby,
in the North Riding of the County of York.*

WE, the undersigned Inhabitants of the Town and Neighbourhood of Whitby, feeling deeply the propriety of presenting an address to Her Majesty, on the late extraordinary and presumptuous movement on the part of the Bishop of Rome, and expressive of our loyalty and attachment to Her Majesty's person, authority, and government, do request that you will be pleased to convene a Meeting for these purposes, to be held at an early day, in some convenient place in the town of Whitby.

Dated, November 21st, 1850.

James Davidson, Minister,	George Clarkson,	} Church-wardens.
John Fox, Minister,	James Wilkinson,	
Joseph Hughes, Minister,	Charles Fisher,	
Francis Simpson,	William Frankland,	
John Cass Potter, Independent Minister,	Thomas Broderick Simpson,	
Henry Belcher,	Henry Simpson,	
William John Bullivant, Wesleyan Minister,	William Cavallier,	
Thomas William Belcher,	John Corner, jun.	
Thomas Richardson,	James Brown,	
John Blanchard,	Charles Prudom,	
Appleton Stephenson,	John Brown Nicholson,	
James Walker,	R. M. Woodwark,	
John Chapman,	William Taylor,	
G. H. Holby,	Francis Kildale Robinson,	
Gideon Smales,	Robert Kirby,	
William Jameson,	Robert Swales,	
Henry Barrick,	John Green,	
Henry Simpson,	Charles Bartindale,	
John Brewster,	William Clarkson,	
John Rickinson,	John Gaskell,	
	William Frankland, jun.	

WE, the undersigned Magistrates, present at a Petty Session, held at the Justice Room, Whitby, this 23rd day of November, 1850, do hereby give notice, that a Public Meeting of the Inhabitants of the Town and Neighbourhood of Whitby, will be held, in compliance with the above Requisition, in the Town Hall, at Whitby, on Thursday, the 28th instant, at Twelve o'clock at noon.

JOHN CHAPMAN,

CHRISTOPHER RICHARDSON, New Buildings.

THE ADDRESS.

GENTLEMEN,

THE copy of a notice on the preceding page, shows that you thought proper to call a public meeting, for the purposes expressed in that bill. Now do not suppose for one moment, that I wish to question either the right, or the propriety of calling such a meeting. If our Protestant countrymen choose to call, and hold meetings for the purpose of expressing their sentiments on any public question, they have certainly, a right to do so, and also a right to the free expression of their sentiments on those occasions. But, gentlemen, have not *we Catholics* also an *equal* right, to express *our* sentiments on those subjects. That a regular opposition to the Catholics, has been lately organized, must be evident to the most inattentive observer. The clergy, and the head of the government, have been placed in the front of the battle, and with cry of danger to the *Church*, has been coupled that of danger to the *Constitution*. In aid of these efforts, the press also, has been put in requisition, and the labours of anti-catholic journalists, and the diffusion of anti-catholic tracts, published in every shape, and adapted to every understanding, bear ample testimony to the zeal, and activity of those, who assume the lead in this anti-catholic crusade. We are doomed to hear daily, our religion traduced, our spiritual but illustrious Head, bespattered with the most vile abuse, our civil liberty menaced, our Clergy threatened with pains, and penalties, our most sacred rights most contumaciously designated by the first minister of the Crown as mummeries, and the Lord High Chancellor

vaunting his readiness to trample, on the mitres of our bishops. Gentlemen, I think it cannot be expected that we Catholics, should remain *silent*, and humble our heads before this whirlwind of Protestant intolerance, and that, imitating the stupidity of the Ostrich, we should endeavour to escape our hunters, by concealing our heads. But, gentlemen, you may perhaps ask, why did you not attend our public meeting? I reply, I did not hear of your meeting until a day after it had been held, but if I had *heard* of it *before*, I should not have attended for the following reasons. Meetings that are convened by one party, are generally *packed* meetings, called under the excitement of the moment, and the audience in general are unwilling to listen to fair play, or to the arguments of their opponents. This was evident from your meeting, for had it not been for the honest, and liberal conduct of your chairman, Christopher Richardson, Esq., Mr. Taylerson, though not a Catholic, would not have obtained a hearing, and how were his sensible questions answered? By shouts, and hisses. But, gentlemen, I have another reason for not attending. Each nation, like each individual, has a certain character, and temperament. Now, whoever will deliberately consider the character, and temperament of Englishmen, will find, that when they are once roused, and excited, they are then unwilling to listen, either to reason or argumentation, but let the heat of excitement pass away, and let the cooler moments of reflection return, and *then*, you may appeal to them with propriety, and advantage. It is very imprudent and foolish for a wife to expostulate, and argue with her drunken husband, but let the moments of sobriety return, and then, her reasonable, and prudent expostulations, may be attended with salutary effects. For these reasons, gentlemen, I did not attend your public meeting.

But you will say, why do you address us in particular? Why, gentlemen, I cannot for a moment suppose that when you are cool, and unexcited, you are so wedded to your own opinions, and so deaf to the claims of fair play, as to be unwilling to listen to the arguments of the *accused*. Surely you do not wish to trample down the accused, *unheard*! If you do, I really think it is a very "extraordinary, and presumptuous movement" on your part, and I am sure every sensible and honest Englishman will think the same.

Well, then, gentlemen, let us now come to the point in question. I begin by asking the very sensible, and rational question, which Mr. Taylerson put to your meeting. What aggression have the Pope and Dr. Wiseman committed? What English Law have they transgressed? If any, why not let the law be calmly and quietly enforced against them? But if they have broken no law, why all this fury, and tirade against them as if they had? Oh, but, replied a certain influential gentleman, at your meeting, "If there is not a law, there must be one made." I answer, that the principle of self-defence will, in cases of real danger, authorize the adoption of lawful precautions, I am not disposed to deny; but, then, those precautions must be founded *on equity*; they must be such as *reason* will justify, or *necessity* excuse. You are not to invade the rights or privileges of others, on the *bare suspicion* of *future* danger or the *mere possibility* of a possibility. You are not to cane a man at Lady-day, because he may affront you at Midsummer. If you think the contrary, I must, gentlemen, candidly tell you, it is a very "extraordinary, and presumptuous movement" on your part, against the rights and privileges of your fellow creatures, and if any Magistrate, were to advance such extraordinary opinions, in a court of justice, I feel confident, every sensible and honest Englishman would deeply feel the propriety, of presenting an address to Her Majesty, or to Her Ministers, on so "extraordinary, and presumptuous a movement" on the part of that Magistrate, against the rights and privileges of Her Majesty's subjects.

Gentlemen, before we proceed any further, I think it requisite to call your attention to two points. First, that your *Protestant* ancestors, *really* did to our *Catholic* ancestors, what you now merely *fancy*, without any grounds, that the *Catholics* of the present day, are wishful to do *to you*. Now, upon this point, I shall thus argue: Your Protestant ancestors did these things either *justly*, or *unjustly* to our Catholic ancestors. If your Protestant ancestors did these things *justly*, why should you Protestants make such a row, at the *mere shadow* of these things being done again? But if your Protestant ancestors, did these things *unjustly*, then you must acknowledge, that the Church of England, owes its first foundation to acts of injustice. The second point which I wish to settle, before I pro-

ceed any further, is that the spiritual members of the Church of Rome, have the most just, and the only claim, to the honourable name of Catholic. Let us now hasten to the first of these points.

Gentlemen, the following facts, as *historical facts*, are *undeniable*, and whoever has the temerity to deny them as *historical facts*, I certainly envy not his knowledge of, nor his veracity for, historical testimony. MARK WELL, I am not going to talk about the soundness, or unsoundness of the following opinions, but I merely wish you to bear it in mind, that it is an *indisputable historical fact*, that these opinions were really, and conscientiously believed by the Christian world in former ages. Well, then, the following are undeniable historical facts: That, in former ages, the Christian world believed that the Catholic Church, was the first Christian Church, and began with our Saviour, that St. Peter was appointed, by divine authority, to be the Head of this Church, that the Popes of Rome were the true successors of St. Peter, by divine authority, and that they were always considered, the one Shepherd, to whom all Christendom owed spiritual obedience. All Christendom, in former ages, with here and there an exception, held these opinions, and when the Christian religion, was introduced into England (which was effectually done about six hundred years after our Saviour), these opinions prevailed in England, as well as in all other Christian countries. The Pope was the Spiritual Head of the Church here, as well as in all the Christian world. He exercised His Spiritual authority, without any co-partnership with, or dependence upon the State. The Catholic Church then also claimed to hold its possessions in the most independent manner, it claimed a prescriptive right to all its possessions; in short, it claimed to hold these possessions as firmly, and as justly, as a man claims the rightful possession of his life, and his free will. Now, mark well, I am not talking, as I just now observed, about the soundness or unsoundness of these opinions, all that I am contending for at present, is, that it is an indisputable historical fact, that these opinions *then* prevailed in all Christian countries, and that they prevailed in England, for at least nine hundred years, for England was, at the very least, nine hundred years a Catholic nation. During the prevalence of these opinions in England, arose churches, parishes, cathedrals, and bishops' sees, monasteries, and many of

our universities, and colleges, *then* Catholic, *but now* Protestant.

Now, it is an historical fact recorded in the English Statute Book, that your Protestant ancestors took from the Pope, his spiritual power in England (~~for he never had any temporal power here, as these pages will handsomely prove to you~~), and your Protestant ancestors took from the Catholics all the rich possessions which belonged, in their estimation, by the strongest titles, to the Catholic Church; and, *mind*, they did this after the Pope had exercised his spiritual power in England, for at least nine hundred years, and after the Catholics had held this church property for at least nine hundred years. But, oh, you will reply, our Protestant ancestors did this by Act of Parliament! I grant it, and surely you will not think it unjust in me, to judge you now by your own acknowledgments. Now, your Protestant ancestors did this *justly*, or *unjustly*. If they did it *justly*, by act of Parliament, why cannot the same thing be done again *justly*, by Act of Parliament? Divide the population of England into two parts, and if you number accurately, you will find, that the Catholics and the Dissenters form, in my humble opinion, the greater half. Should, therefore, the Catholics and Dissenters, obtain an Act of Parliament, to take this church property from you Protestants, what reasonable arguments could you advance against it? Turn the question up, or down, you could not possibly escape. If you allege that you have had possession for three hundred years, the Catholics and Dissenters will reply, the Catholics had held it for at least nine hundred years. If you argue it was given by Act of Parliament to your Protestant Church, the Catholics and Dissenters will reply, the Catholics held it, by the sanction of Government, for nine hundred years at least. In short, turn the argument as you please, you are in a *regular fix*. Oh, what a powerful, and unanswerable argument, have you forced me to put into the mouths of the Dissenters, against *your* church property, even if you got it justly! Allow me then to ask you, why all this tirade and fury about the *mere fancy* of a thing being done to you, which you assert, your ancestors did *justly* to the Catholics. But if you took this property *unjustly* from the Catholics, then it is as plain as the noon-day sun, that the Protestant Church, was first founded upon acts of *injustice*.

But some will perhaps imagine, we really wish to take the church property from the Protestants. In the Catholic times of England, the church property was divided into three parts, one was for the support of the clergy, another was for the repair of the churches, and the third was for the support of the poor, and this third was always administered to the poor with the most scrupulous exactness.* Hence, among all the barefaced calumnies, which have been uttered against the Catholics, even her bitterest enemies, could never say that she was unjust to the poor. But the Protestant *reformed* Church thought it would be the least trouble, to put these *three parts* into *one whole* sum, and apply the *whole* of that sum to *themselves*, and then, leave the nation to supply the other two parts, by *Church rates*, and *Poor rates*. Now, let the Protestant Church, only give back to the poor, that part which she unjustly took from them, and as for the rest, I can only say, God speed them with it, and long may they enjoy it.

Some of you gentlemen certainly appear, to be *worthy* descendents of your Protestant ancestors, for *they* took from us our church possessions, *you* are now enjoying these church possessions, but not content with our possessions, you wish to deprive us even of our *very name*; for you are endeavouring, by every artifice, to deceive the people, and make them believe—*you* and not *we* are the real Catholics. You remind me of the words of the Poet,

“Who steals my purse, steals trash,
 ’Twas mine, tis his, and has been slave to thousands;
 But he who filches from me my good name,
 Robs me of that which not enriches him, but makes me poor indeed.”

You tell the people we Papists are Roman Catholics, but *you* Protestants, are the *real* Catholics. Let us then, take up the Dictionary, and *see* what is the real meaning of the word, *Catholic*. According to the Dictionary, the word (Catholic) means universal. Of course, then, when the word (Catholic) is applied to a Church, it must mean the Universal Church. Let us then now see *which* is the Universal Christian Church, and then we shall be able to judge,

* Lingard's Anglo Saxon, vol. 1, p. 189, 190.

who have the greatest right to the honourable name of Catholic. The testimony which I shall cite to prove, that we are the most numerous body of Christians, is that of Macaulay, a celebrated Protestant historian of the present day, and whose historical pages have been quoted against us, in many of the late public meetings, that have been held. Of course, if his testimony is worthy of belief when *against*, it must also be so when *for* us. Speaking of the great body of the Roman Catholic Church, Macaulay says, "The numbers of her communion are certainly not *fewer* than 150,000,000, and it will be difficult to shew that all the other Christian sects *united* amount to 120,000,000."* (Ed. Rev., Oct. 1840, p. 228.) You here see, that Macaulay tells you, that the Roman Catholics amount to *at least* 150,000,000, whilst all other Christian sects *united* into one body, scarcely form 120,000,000. As therefore the Roman Catholics form the greatest body of Christians, they must be the Universal Church. But the Dictionary tells us, that the word Catholic means Universal, therefore the Church of Rome is alone both Universal and Catholic, and consequently has the most just and only claim to the ancient and honourable name of Catholic.

I thought, gentlemen, before we proceeded to the main subjects in discussion, we had better settle the two above points. For after you had seen, that your Protestant ancestors had *really* and *actually* done to the Catholics, what you *merely fancy* the Pope and the Catholics are wishful at present to do to you, you would not think it *unreasonable* in us, to claim your attention, whilst we shewed you the unreasonable grounds of your *present* fears and alarms, and that, after you had seen, that *we* have the *only* just claim to the

* Macaulay, tells us, that the number of Roman Catholics is not fewer than 150,000,000, and that it would be difficult to shew that all the other Christian sects united, amount, to 120,000,000. I quite agree with his words, "not fewer," and "it would be difficult to shew;" for upon an accurate calculation, it would be found that the Catholics amount nearer to 200,000,000, than to 150,000,000, and that all the other Christian sects, united into one body, are nearer 100,000,000, than 120,000,000. However, Macaulay's statement is quite sufficient to prove what we have cited it for, viz:—that the Roman Catholics are the greatest body of Christians, and therefore have the best title to the ancient and honourable name of Catholic.

honourable name of Catholic,* you would not be startled, at hearing so often in these pages, that ancient name applied to the Spiritual members of the Pope in these realms.

Let us now, gentlemen, proceed to the subject which has so lately alarmed you, and many other Englishmen. There is nothing, that shews a man to be so little, as to bluster, and talk about a subject, which he does not understand. Now, gentlemen, had you been asked at the meeting, what the Pope's Bull was? or, what the Catholic Hierarchy meant? what a poser it would have been to the limbs of the law, or even to the limbs of the Church, who attended your meeting; for they either understood these subjects, or they did not. If they really understood them, I am sure these pages will shew every sensible person, they had no reason to consider the conduct of the Pope, either "extraordinary or presumptuous," and if they did not understand them, I really think it a very "extraordinary and presumptuous movement" on their part, to talk against their fellow Christians on subjects, of which they were ignorant. Had I done so, would they not have been tempted to apply to me the words of the Poet?

"A shallow brain beyond a serious mask,
An Oracle within an empty cask."

For your information therefore, I will state in short, what we Catholics mean by the Hierarchy, and the Pope's Bull. We all know, that good *temporal* government, consists in having all the various rights of its members, properly understood, and justly protected. Thus the Queen, the Peers, the Commoners, the Magistrates, in short, the higher classes, the middle classes, and the lower classes,

* In the Apostle's Creed, *we all* profess to believe in the *Holy Catholic* Church. Now, if this is not *our* Church, I would ask, what Church *is it*? Is it the collection of sects which have sprung from the Reformation? But, then, it would not be *Catholic*, for as they are the smaller number, they cannot claim universality. Is it the Theological hodge-podge, the farrago of all the religions, which believe in the Gospels? Then it cannot be *Holy*, for we should form the *principal* part of it, and you know, the immaculate Church of England tells us, our doctrines are idolatrous. I really think, people had better leave us in the *quiet* possession of our old inheritance, the honourable and ancient name of Catholic, and *then* they would avoid the above ridiculous consequences.

have all their rights properly defined, and their several interests justly attended to in a good temporal government. Now reason tells us, that this ought to be the case in a good *spiritual* government, and we Catholics maintain, that these objects are best attained by the means of a spiritual Hierarchy; and, at the same time we believe, that this spiritual Hierarchy, can be established only by the spiritual power of the Pope. When the Pope therefore thinks, that either the number of his spiritual members, or their spiritual necessities, require the establishment of the Hierarchy, in any part of the world, he issues his spiritual Bull, or decrees to that effect; and all the Archbishops, and Bishops, and Clergy, and laity, to whom this spiritual government is extended, receive it as a spiritual boon, and fully understand and believe, that it has regard *only* to *spiritual* matters. They all know, and believe, that it has nothing to do with any *temporal* matters whatever, in any shape or form, directly or indirectly, and if any person, after this explanation, was so impudent as to maintain, that the Hierarchy, or the Pope's Bull, had any reference to any *temporal* matters, either directly, or indirectly, affecting the *temporal* power of Her Majesty, over Her Catholic subjects, and the *temporal* allegiance which they owe to Her Majesty, my loyalty for our gracious Queen, and my feelings of honour, would tempt me to address him in the words of the Poet,

“ A lie, an odious lie,
Upon my word, a lie, a wicked lie.”

Gentlemen, after this short explanation of the Hierarchy, and of the Pope's Bull, I appeal to you as free-born Englishmen, whether there can be any English law, or statute against it? If there be, where is our vaunted boast, of “liberty of conscience *to all*?” Now MARK, whether there be any law in the Statute Book against it, I do not pretend to have sufficient of the lawyer in me to determine, but *this*, I will shew you, that the acts of the Pope, in establishing the spiritual Hierarchy in this kingdom, by his Bull, or spiritual decrees, are in keeping with the spirit, upon which the English law has acted during these late years.

By the spirit of the English law, we, Catholics, are allowed to maintain the Pope's supremacy in ecclesiastical, and religious matters; we are also allowed to be governed by Catholic Bishops, and

of course, we are allowed to be governed by them, according to the proper and perfect form of Episcopal government, and there is no English law, to prevent these Catholic Bishops from taking the titles of any place, provided they are not titles of places, held by the Anglican Hierarchy. Now, these conditions have been observed, in the late establishment of the Catholic Hierarchy in these realms.

And that it is in keeping with the spirit of the English Law, Lord John Russell's own words, will convince you. In the House of Commons, August 6th, 1846, he said, "There is another offence of introducing a Bull of the Pope into the country, the question is, whether it is desirable to keep up that, or any other penalty, for such an offence. It does appear to me, that we cannot possibly attempt, to prevent the introduction of the Pope's Bulls into this country. There are certain Bulls of the Pope, which are *absolutely necessary*, for the appointment of Bishops and Pastors, belonging to the Roman Catholic Church. It would be quite *impossible*, to prevent the introduction of such Bulls." (Hansard, vol. lxxxviii., p. 362.) Again, what said Lord Lyndhurst, speaking, in the House of Lords. "You tolerate the Catholic Prelates, and you know, that these Prelates cannot carry on, their Church Establishment, without holding communication with the Pope of Rome. If the laws allow the doctrine, and discipline of the Roman Catholic Church, it (the Roman Catholic Church) ought to be permitted, to be carried on *perfectly* and *properly*." (Hansard, vol. lxxxv., p. 1261.) So you see, that this Noble Lord proclaims, that to pretend to *tolerate* the Catholic Religion as we do; and *yet*, *prevent* the Catholics from holding *free* communication with the Pope, would be a mere nullity. The Catholics, says he, should be allowed to carry out the organization of their Church *perfectly* and *properly*. Now, *this* cannot be done without the *Hierarchy*. Accordingly, all the penal laws in question were, then and there, torn from the statute book.

Also Joseph Hume, Esq., who may be justly styled, the father of the present House of Commons, and who, in that House, has been so long the promoter, the pillar, and the bulwark of civil and religious liberty, honourably, and openly, tells the world, that the Pope is warranted, in all he has done, by the proceedings of Sir Robert Peel's

government. These are the words of the noble champion of civil and religious liberty—"Your view of the subject, will be adopted as soon as the thinking part of the public, get their eyes opened to the real merits of the alleged innovation. I say alleged, because Mr. C. C. Grenville has shewn, that the Pope is warranted in all he has done, by the proceedings of Sir Robert Peel's government, which were not at the time objected to by any person, except by Sir Robert Inglis, and his limited class."—(Joseph Hume, to the Editor of the *Hull Advertiser*, Nov. 18th, 1850.)

There was a time, when the Protestant Bishops were excluded, for some time, from the House of Lords. In 1661, a motion was made to restore these Protestant Prelates to their seats, and *mind*, six and twenty Catholic Peers voted in favour of these Protestant Bishops. But such is the illiberality of the present time, that now, the Catholics find the most determined and eager opposition on the Bishop's bench. There are, however, exceptions; few, indeed, but on that account, more entitled to our gratitude. Long will the name of the late Bishop of Norwich, be cherished in the remembrance of every sincere Catholic. And happy am I to observe, another Protestant Prelate, willing to walk in his charitable footsteps. I mean the sensible, the pious, and the learned present Protestant Bishop of St. Davids. This illustrious Protestant Prelate, liberally and candidly, told the Archbishop of Canterbury, that in his humble opinion, "the provision cited from the Act of Elizabeth, has been virtually repealed by the Roman Catholic Relief Act * * * * And it was equally set 'at defiance,' by the appointment of Vicars Apostolic, who have so long exercised their functions without complaint or molestation. And it seems unreasonable, to charge the Pope with defying a law which, has been so long permitted to sleep." For these and other reasons, this most liberal minded Protestant Prelate, lately refused to sign the address of the other Protestant Bishops to the Queen. (Bishop of St. Davids to the Archbishop of Canterbury, Nov. 26th, 1850.) Well I cannot but gratefully, address this generous Prelate in the words of the poet—

——— "I quit you now,

But peradventure I may come again!
Your bounteous kindness ne'er shall be forgot,
While beats this warm heart within my bosom."

Certainly, you will say, these are high, and weighty authorities on the Catholic side, and clearly demonstrate, that there can be nothing wrong, on the Pope's sending his *Bulls*, into *this* country. But, perhaps, the *greatest* grievance lies in *this*, that the *Catholic* Bishops, have assumed *English* titles, calling themselves Bishops of Hexham, of Beverley, &c. *This*, you hear it said, is *contrary to all* law and decency. Now, *mark*, gentlemen, how soon I shall prove to you, that it is neither against law, nor decency. I observe that the law as it regards Catholics, *forbids only one* thing, it forbids *Catholic* Bishops, to assume the titles of *Protestant* sees. Thus it forbids us, to have an Archbishop of *Canterbury*, or a Bishop of *London*, of *Durham*, &c. And why so? Because there are *Protestant* Bishops of *these* places. But it *manifestly* allows us to take the titles of *those* places, in which, there are no *Protestant* Bishops. For, if the law meant, to exclude us from *all* places and *all* titles *whatsoever*, why did it *not say so*? But, it says *no such* thing. It excludes us *only* from places where there are *Protestant* Bishops. Well, this restrictive law, the *only* law, that there is upon the question, has been most *scrupulously* observed in *every* instance by the Catholics. Not *one* of their Bishops, has assumed the title of any *Protestant* see. For who ever heard of a *Protestant* Bishop of Hexham, of Beverley, or of Liverpool. How then can it be contrary to law? But I have yet, more to say on this subject. Lord John Russell is an advocate for the repeal of *even this restrictive* law, which he considers, an absurdity in a land of religious liberty. Nay, he considers it *childish* to hold the Catholics under such restrictions. "I believe," said he (in July 19th, 1845, speaking in the House of Commons,) "I believe we may repeal, those insulting clauses, which prevent a Roman Catholic assuming a title held, by a Bishop of the Established Church. I can conceive *no good* grounds, for the continuance of this restriction." (Hansard, vol. lxxxii., p. 290.) And again on February 5, 1846, as to preventing persons assuming *particular* titles, nothing can be more *absurd* and *puerile*, than to keep up *such* a distinction." (Hansard, vol. lxxxiii., p. 502.) Now, gentlemen, *this* was spoken in the *House of Commons*, and by the *first* Minister of the Crown. You see, *he* vindicates for the Catholics, *greater* liberty than *they* have

either *exercised*, or *demand*ed ; the liberty to have Catholic Bishops, *side by side*, with the *Protestant* Bishops *throughout* the land. And yet, let me ask, did the then Member for *Whitby*, or indeed *any*, of the thirty and more members, who represent this great county of York, raise a *voice* against *these* opinions and views ? Did they cry out, that *this*, would be an *innovation* of the *Royal* prerogative, and an *encroachment* upon the *spiritual*, or *civil* liberties of this realm. No, *not they*, not *one* of them. Both the *Parliament* and the *Public* heard *all* this, either with *approbation*, or with *indifference*. Judge, then, with what scorn the Catholics, hear themselves charged with insidiousness, and aggression. Insidiousness ! Why, the leaders of the two great portions, in the state (for who stood *higher* with the *Tories* than *Lord Lyndhurst*, and among the *Whigs*, than *Lord John Russell*), and yet, these *two* leaders, *actually* encouraged, and invited the Catholics *to do*, what they *have* done. I repeat, they not only claimed for the Catholics the *right to do* them, but *encouraged* them *to do* them. After the Catholics had *thus* been encouraged, and backed by two of the first leaders, *one* of the *Whigs*, and *one* of the *Tories*, after they had received the sanction of the *public* by its silence, or indifference on these points, the Catholics at last received the Hierarchy from the Pope's hands ; when lo ! Lord John Russell, immediately writes a flaming philippic on the subject, suddenly and unjustly rouses the indignation of the people ; and the Protestant clergy immediately head the crusade against the Catholics, for *doing*, what they had been encouraged, and invited *to do* by two of the first ministers of the land, and *for doing*, what the English *public* had *already* sanctioned, by its silence, or by its indifference. Really, gentlemen, was not this a "most extraordinary and presumptuous movement" on the *rights* of your Catholic fellow subjects ? And, *this*, in the *nineteenth* century, when the march of intellect, and of civil, and religious liberty, have been making such rapid progress in the British Empire. But what have I to say to Lord John Russell's late letter ? I answer, it is not *my* business to reconcile Lord John Russell's *former* declarations, with *his present late* proceedings, they are as *marvellous* and *unaccountable* in the eyes of the *public*, as they are in *mine*. He will shortly have to

give an account of his stewardship, before the Parliament, in whose presence, he made *the declarations*, which I have *quoted*. If he means to continue a *Champion of civil and religious liberty*, he must *retrace* his steps—but if he chooses to *abandon the sacred cause*, then, he will dwindle into a *most insignificant, and contemptible statesman*: and will not be *permitted long to direct* the government of a *free and liberal* people.

Thus you see, gentlemen, that the words of Lord John Russell, and of Lord Lyndhurst, the opinion of Joseph Hume, Esq., and that of the learned Protestant Bishop of St. Davids, plainly shew, that the late acts of the Pope, have been in keeping, with the present spirit of the English law.

Hence in Ireland, the Catholic Hierarchy, has not only been recognised, but royally honoured; and the same form of Ecclesiastical Government, has been gradually extended, to the greater part of our Colonies. Australia was the first, which obtained this spiritual advantage, and this was *openly* done, and was *publicly* known, and yet, no remonstrance was ever made against it. The Catholic Prelates of Australia, in every document, are addressed by their titles, and are acknowledged, and salaried, as Archbishops and Bishops, respectively, and this not by one, but by successive English governments. Our North American possessions, were the next, to receive this spiritual government, Kingston, Byetown, Toronto, and Halifax, have been erected into dioceses by the Holy See, and the titles of their respective Bishops, are acknowledged by their local governments. The Holy See, has also formed a new ecclesiastical province in the West Indies, where several Vicars Apostolic, have been appointed with titles, and with all the spiritual powers, allowed by the Hierarchy. Now, gentlemen, if the Catholics of *Ireland*, and the Catholics of our *English* Colonies, are thus allowed by Government, to enjoy the spiritual benefits of the Hierarchy, do you not think it unreasonable, that the Catholics of *England*, should be refused the same spiritual blessings? Do not the Dissenters also, enjoy in England, the free exercise of *their* spiritual powers? Dr. Dillon, assumed the power, and ordained, what he called Presbyters, and no Englishman thought proper, to call him to account, for assuming those spiritual powers. The Moravians, and the Irvinites

or the Apostolicals, have their Bishops in England, and yet, they are not taxed with illegality. The Scotch Kirk, the Baptists, the Methodists, the Quakers, the Independents, the Presbyterians, and all other Dissenters, appoint their Ministers for themselves, and mark the limits of the separate districts, in which they are to exercise their spiritual authority, and yet, no one has the presumption, to question the legality of their exercising such authority in England. If therefore, all these various dissenting sects are allowed these spiritual privileges, why should the English freeborn Catholics, be debarred from them ?

Her present Majesty was advised to erect, and did erect, (5 Vic. cap. 6.) a Bishopric of Jerusalem, and assigned to it a diocess, in which the three great Patriarchates of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria, were formed into one See, which had episcopal jurisdiction over Syria, Caldea, Egypt, and Abyssinia, and subject to further limitations, or alterations at the Royal Will. Now do any of these possessions belong to Her Majesty ? No. But you may reply, there are in some, and may be in others, British Protestants, and therefore, the Queen thought proper, to extend Her spiritual blessings to them. Granted. Why therefore, has not the Pope, an equal right to extend *his* spiritual blessings to the Catholics of England ? It is plain then, that the Irish Catholics, and the Catholics of many of our Colonies, are allowed to exercise *their* spiritual rights unmolested, it is plain that all other dissenting sects, are allowed to enjoy in England the same spiritual privileges, and it is plain likewise, that the Queen assumes and exercises abroad, in the most independent manner, Her spiritual powers, tell me then, in the name of common sense, by what law, either human, or divine, you wish to deprive the English Catholics of the free exercise of *their* spiritual rights ?

Oh, but you will object, "the Pope has assumed a right over us Protestants, he has parcelled out the land of England, he has named Archbishops and Bishops, and appointed them to rule over *us*, whom he impudently styles heretics." To this objection, gentlemen, I reply, Do the Catholics in England acknowledge the Queen's supremacy in *spiritual* matters ? Do the Dissenters of England acknowledge Her supremacy in *spiritual* matters ? No. Now

divide the English population into two parts, and if you calculate accurately, you will find, that the greater half of the English population, consists of Catholics and Dissenters, who do not acknowledge the Queen's *spiritual* supremacy. But when the Queen issues Her Spiritual Instruments, or if you please, Bulls, does she not parcel out the land of England? Does she not name Archbishops, and Bishops, and *apparently* appoint them to rule over *us Catholics* and *Dissenters*, in short, does *She* not in those Spiritual Instruments, or Bulls, *apparently* assume over *us Catholics* and *Dissenters*, the very same spiritual power, which the Pope appears to assume, in His Bulls, over Protestant Englishmen? But do you ever hear of *us Catholics*, or *Dissenters*, styling this an extraordinary movement on the part of the Queen? No. Because we have the common sense to know, that such parcelling out of the land, and such extension of Her *Spiritual* Authority to her Archbishops, and Bishops, regard only the *real* Protestants of the land, and that they have no more to do with *us* and the *Dissenters*, in a *spiritual* point of view, than they have with the inhabitants of Turkey.

If you would likewise ask some of the limbs of the law, who attended your meeting, they would inform you, that in Acts of Parliament, that in deeds, and in the drawing up almost all the various instruments of the law, there are certain forms, which to *us* appear most ridiculous, and outrageous, and if you questioned them on these points, and asked them, about all this strange rigmarole of words and of phraseology, they would tell you, it is only a certain necessary form in law, and that although it may appear strange to *other* people, still, it is perfectly understood *by all*, who are versed in the laws of the land.* Why cannot these gentlemen, therefore, have the

* I have sometimes been asked, and the question has sometimes been slyly popped to me, and to others, by certain limbs of the law, if I was a *Jesuit*? I answer first, that I have not the honour to belong to that learned, and much calumniated body, the *Jesuits*. I answer secondly, I perfectly understood the *sly* drift of these *questions*, and *inuendoes*. It was as good as to say, "Jesuitism is a strange compound of all kinds of tricks and quirks, and of mental reservations, and deceptions. Now this little spectacle fellow, is one of them, and therefore, he is up to all the *Jesuitical* trade, and is a perfect specimen of it. Nay, I believe, that he could slyly board us with his *Jesuitical* tricks, *even*

good sense to extend this explanation to the Pope's Bull, and then they would find this parcelling out the land by the Pope's Bull, and this delegation of spiritual power, of Archbishops, and Bishops, as if extending to Protestants, was a mere phantom of their own imagination, and that in reality, it regarded *none*, but the *spiritual* subjects of the *Pope* in this kingdom, and that it did not regard *even them*, only in a *spiritual*, and *not* in a *temporal* point of view, either directly or indirectly.

while we were looking on." Well, one good turn certainly deserves another. And now, I must as politely as I can, tell these limbs of the law, that if I am to judge of the law from the little, that I have really seen, and know about *them*, and that if Jesuitism be *really*, what they *imagine* it is, and if the whole of England ever became Catholic, and then, from Catholicism jumped to Jesuitism, in this case, I certainly think that these limbs of the law, will not have to study, the celestial arts of Jesuitism, as pourtrayed in their own imagination; for they will be *already*, perfectly dubbed masters of Israel in that art, and they will certainly occupy distinguished places, in the various departments of *mental reservations*, pious frauds, and charitable tricks and quirks upon their neighbour's pockets. Really this reminds me of Paddy, who had just arrived from Ireland, and was *sneeringly* asked by a *busy* Englishman, what kind of a crop of Murphies, they had had in Ireland? Pat had a shillalah in his hand, he up with it, knocked down the Englishman, and said; "And sure your honour, we have had a very good crop of Murphies, and you may know it by the feel, for that is the stalk of one." Now, I hope these limbs of the law, will not be offended at me for taking up my spectacle shillalah, and just politely flooring them, for their *Jesuitical inuendoes* and *mental reservations* in my regard. I hope they will not be offended, at my defending myself, for their own profession will teach them, that every one is allowed fair play, whether he be a metamorphosed calumniated Jesuit, or a limb of the law in the body of a man's pocket. But far be it from me to adopt their extensive, and sweeping mode of argumentation, viz., the law of the land is a heap of deceptions, and tricks, now such a man is a lawyer, therefore he must be a sleight-of-hand gentleman in that art. Before I make this sweeping conclusion, I ought *first*, to examine seriously, and carefully, if the law *really is*, this strange compound of deceptions, and I ought then, to examine and really know, that this lawyer has really acted according to this deception, I ought to do this, before I condemn him personally, or open the floodgates of condemnation on the whole respectable body of lawyers. This is the argumentation which reason and justice tell me I ought to adopt. Now just let these limbs of the law, adopt this line of argumentation with regard to Jesuitism and Jesuits, and then, they will be both limbs of the law, and limbs of fair play.

I observe, in your public notice for your meeting, two Dissenting Ministers, put their names to the requisition. Now, although the Protestant Church may *honour* these gentlemen, with the name of *Reverend*, does it consider them to be ministers? It certainly does not.* And I will prove it to you. If these Ministers were to go over to the *Protestant* Church, it would ordain them, and by that act, tell them that *before*, they were mere *phantoms* of Ministers, and that they had *never* had any spiritual power, or jurisdiction whatever. If therefore the orthodox Protestant gentleman, whose name stands so conspicuously between these two Dissenting Reverends, were to be asked, why he styled them Reverends, when his own Church, considers them as mere phantoms of Ministers, what would he say? Of course he would tell us, it was a mere matter of courtesy, for he was obliged to agree with his Church, that they were mere phantoms of Ministers. Now, gentlemen, just apply this to the Pope's Bull in *your* regard. You read the Pope's Bull, and erroneously imagine that the spiritual powers, which it asserts, really regards (or is to regard) you Protestants. Whereas you ought to consider it, as a *mere phantom* of *spiritual* power in *your* regard, and I moreover add, you ought to consider it, as a mere phantom in any *temporal* point of view, even as it regards *the Catholics*. Do this, gentlemen, and then, you will perceive, that the idea of it extending to *you* Protestants, either in any *spiritual*, or *temporal* point of view, whatever, is a mere chimera of your own imaginations.

But after all, I know many of you will *still* urge, that the Pope may *gradually* extend his *spiritual* power over you, and then, by degrees extend his *temporal* power over you, until at last, he has completely established over you his spiritual and temporal domination. Gentlemen, I will answer this argument shortly indeed, but I

* But some one will perhaps inquire, does the Protestant Church consider *your* Catholic Ministers *really* ordained? I reply she does, for were any Catholic Priest to go over to the Protestant Church, she would not ordain him. And why? Because the Protestant Church got her ordinations (if she has any) from us, and to question *our* ordination, would be to strike at the foundation of *her* own.

hope satisfactorily, and I feel confident that, unless you are as the poet says,

“ Convince a man against his will,
He'll hold the same opinion still,”

you will be convinced, from what I shall advance, that the above objection, is another chimera of your own imaginations.

True and genuine religion, must be founded on the free, and spontaneous consent of the heart. If therefore, you Protestants ever allow the Pope, to extend his spiritual power over you, *without* having *first* sincerely, and deliberately considered the *real* grounds of the Catholic Faith, and of the Pope's title to spiritual supremacy, and without your having *first* given your *free*, and *spontaneous* consent to them, I hope you will forgive me, if I politely tell you, I should consider you as a set of religious donkeys, and that you ought not to be allowed to *bray* in this free country.

But you will object, it will be *you* Catholics headed by the Pope, that will make us renounce the *Protestant*, and embrace the *Catholic* faith. To this objection I answer. First, the Catholics of England have promised to maintain, support, and defend, to the utmost of their power, the succession to the crown. Now, this succession, by an act entitled, “ an act for the further limitation of the crown, is, and stands limited to the Princess Sophia, Electress, Duchess Dowager of Hanover, and to the heirs of her Body, *being Protestants*. Such are the very terms of the oath, which we Catholics have taken ; as long therefore, as the Established Church is secure of having a Protestant Sovereign, it cannot be in any danger of subversion.

Secondly. The Irish Catholics have gone still further, and to silence even the predictions of their enemies, have disclaimed, disavowed, and solemnly abjured every intention, to subvert the present Church Establishment, for the purpose of substituting a Catholic Establishment in its stead, and have solemnly sworn, that they will not exercise any privilege, to which they are, or may be entitled, to disturb, or weaken the Protestant religion in that kingdom.

Thirdly. But I will suppose for a moment, that the Catholics were at last to determine to perjure themselves, and to violate the

promises, to which they are so solemnly pledged, let us see the obstacles, they would have to surmount. First, there would be the Sovereign, the head of the Protestant Church, with the immense patronage of the Crown at her (or his) disposal; secondly, there would be all the spiritual Peers, and with the exception of a few Catholics, all the temporal Peers; thirdly, there would be the great majority in the House of Commons, in proportion to at least, ten Protestants to one Catholic. Now, by what spirit of magic, are a *few* Catholic Peers, to become the *majority* of the House of Lords, or is *one* Catholic Commoner, to outvote *ten* Protestants. By what miracle, is the Queen (or King) to abandon the defence of *that* Church, of which she (or he) is by conviction a member, and by law, supreme head? By what manœuvres, are the Catholics so to blind the confidence of the Sovereign, as to worm themselves into the possession of all places, of power, and trust? Before the Catholics can aid the Pope to extend his temporal or spiritual power over you Protestants, they will have to surmount all the above obstacles. But by what human power can they ever surmount the above obstacles? Really, gentlemen, is it not childish to talk either about Catholics forcing you to become Catholics, or their wishing to aid the Pope, to extend his spiritual or temporal domination over you Protestants, with all the above obstacles staring you in the face.

But, gentlemen, if on the other hand, you should think proper to seriously, and conscientiously, examine the *real* grounds of the Catholic religion, and if you should think proper, to examine *seriously*, and *conscientiously*, whether the Pope, is the *real* successor of Saint Peter, and of course in that case, the *real* spiritual head of Christ's Church, if you should ask yourselves the reason, why the Catholic Faith, has been the belief of the most extensive, and enlightened nations of Europe, and of the most illustrious characters, that ever did honour to the name of man,* if upon careful

* "Catholicity, which has been this night, the subject of so much abuse, has been the belief of the most extensive, and enlightened nations in Europe, and of the most illustrious characters, that ever did honour to the name of man."— (Speech of Lord Hutchinson in the House of Lords, May 10th, 1805.)

investigation, you should find that the Catholic Faith, was the faith of those, who built our Cathedrals, who erected our Universities, who laid the foundation of our envied Constitution, and who secured the great charter of our rights at Runnymede, in short, if you should find that the members of this creed, have in every age, stood forth the champions of liberty, and at the same time remained faithful worshippers of God, if after the most careful, and impartial investigation, you should find all these things to be real, and undeniable facts, *then* I would address you in the words, with which St. Paul addressed King Agrippa, “I would to God, that both in little, and in much, not only thou, but also, all that hear me this day, should become such as I also am, except these bonds.” (Acts, ch. xxvi., v. 28.) Yes, gentlemen, I repeat it, if after the most serious, and minute investigation, you should find the above things *real*, and *undeniable* facts, *then*, gentlemen, the sincere wish of my heart would be, that you might all become Catholics, and the *spiritual* children of the head of our Church, but, *mind*, without our bonds, that is, without having to suffer, what our Catholic ancestors had to suffer for their faith,* a faith, which they conscientiously held as their best inheritance, and which, they held more dear, than life itself.

I would also address you in the words, in which Gamaliel, a doctor of the law, addressed the Jewish Council respecting the Apostles, who were unjustly cast into prison. “And now, there-

* The following are the words of Mr. Cobbett, a protestant, writer respecting the introduction of the Protestant religion into these realms. “The Queen (Elizabeth) reigned for forty-five years, and these forty-five years, were spent in deeds of such cruelty, as the world had never heard of, or read of before; and all for the purpose of compelling her people, to submit to this established (Protestant) Church. With regard to the cruelties of this monster, in woman’s shape, her butcherings, her rippings up, her tearing out of the bowels of her subjects, her torments of every description, in which she was always cordially supported, by the lawgiving makers of the (Protestant) prayer book, I must refer the reader, to my history of the Protestant reformation; suffice it to say (here), that in these forty-five years, which were employed in the establishing of this Church, there were more cruelty, more bloodshed, more suffering, than ever were witnessed in the world, in any other country in a like period of time.” (Cobbett’s Legacy to Parsons, p. 38.)

fore, I say to you, refrain from these men, and let them alone : for if this counsel, or this work, be of men, it will come to nought ; but if it be of God, you cannot overthrow it, lest perhaps, even you be found to fight against God." (Acts, ch. 5, v. 38, 39.) Gentlemen, if the Catholic Faith, be an invention of *human* counsel, and a work of *human* policy, rest assured, it will of *itself* crumble into nought, but if it be *of God*, and if it be the *will of God*, that England should return to her ancient faith, you cannot overthrow it, and you cannot fight against God, for as the wise man says, "there is no wisdom, there is no prudence, there is no counsel against the Lord." (Prov. ch. xxi., v. 30.)

Gentlemen, I think you must acknowledge, that I have answered, shortly indeed, but I hope satisfactorily, your objection, as to the Pope's gradually extending his *spiritual*, and temporal domination over you Protestants. Gentlemen, I am not aware, that any one at your meeting, was so uncourteous as to throw in the face of Catholics, either the Gunpowder, or Oates' plots. Still, you are aware, that it has been done at *many* of the late meetings, and in many places of England, to the injustice of Catholics. Allow me, to solicit your attention, whilst I say a few words respecting each of these plots, and whilst I show you, it is most unjust to throw those diabolical plots in the face of Catholics, either of the present, or of former ages.

The Guy Fawkes plot, or as it is usually termed, the Gunpowder Plot, is often sneeringly, and insultingly thrown in the face of Catholics. Now let it be remembered, that the original conspirators were only eight in number, that they were also of the most abandoned character, and that some of them, years before, had abjured the Catholic faith, and let it also be remembered, that this plot was disclosed even by a Catholic, Lord Monteagle, and that the Pope in a letter expressed his detestation of it, and ordered the Catholic clergy, to prevent by all means in their power, all similar conspiracies, and to exhort the people to patience and obedience. Now I ask, is it reasonable, that the wicked deeds of these few and abandoned conspirators, should be thrown in the face of the whole body of Catholics ; as well might you upbraid our Saviour with the crimes of Judas. The plot was unknown to all good Catholics, they

had nothing whatever to do with it, and it, and all other plotting whatever, were condemned and forbidden in the most severe manner, by the Clergy and the Pope. What could Catholics do more? Why, therefore, are the Catholics of the present times to be condemned for a plot with which they had no more to do, than the Protestants of the present day? But I will suppose for a moment, this diabolical plot was concocted by real Catholics. Can it be reasonably urged, against the Catholics of the present day? If you answer, yes, I will then prove that the Ministers who attended your meeting, were cursers, murderers, and deserters of Christ. For if you ask each of them, if he is a minister of Christ, he will answer, certainly. Well, then, one of the Apostles betrayed our Saviour, another by oaths and curses, denied him, and all deserted him on the night of his passion. Now, if the above line of argumentation, against Catholics be valid, then I may conclude, that the Ministers who attended your meeting, were murderers, cursers, deniers, and deserters of Christ. Really, if I were to adopt this mode of argumentation against them, you would think, and justly, the *upper stories* of my intellect were of a very strange structure. How can persons, therefore, have the barefacedness to apply such reasoning to the Catholics of the present day, respecting the Gunpowder Plot.

Whoever will read the history of Titus Oates's Plot, will find that it was concocted against the Catholics, by some of the brightest characters for rascality, and perjury, and infamy, and cruelty, that the world ever beheld. Oates' plot consisted in this, that he accused the Catholics, and Jesuits in particular, of a plot, to murder King Charles the II., (1678), to transfer the sovereignty of the realm to the Pope, and to extirpate the Protestant religion from the land. But was not Titus Oates himself a *Jesuit*, or at least, a *Catholic*? You shall hear who Titus Oates was, from the *pen* of *Protestant* Historians.

“Oates, the former of this dreadful plot, was himself the most infamous of mankind. He was the son of an Anabaptist preacher, took orders in the Church of England, became chaplain on board the fleet, and was dismissed for some unnatural practices, not fit to be named.” (See Hume's History.) You shall hear too, who his

accomplices were ; “ Bedloe, a man, if *possible*, more infamous than Oates himself ;” (See Hume’s History.) And these were soon backed by others. “ A wretch, named Carstairs led the way, and soon, from all the brothels, gambling houses, and spunging-houses of London, *false witnesses* poured in, to swear away the lives of Roman Catholics.” (See Macaulay’s History of England.) And yet, on the barefaced testimony, of these abandoned, and infamous wretches, the Catholic Noblemen and Gentlemen, were, with the exception of the Duke of York, expelled from their seats in Parliament. Some of them, (although as innocent of the crimes of which they were accused, as the new-born babe), were tried, and executed on the false, and contradictory evidence, of these base wretches. All of them, died protesting their innocence ; and many of them, embraced the opportunity to declare their abhorrence, of the doctrines so commonly, but so unjustly, attributed to Catholics. Their speeches at the place of execution, are still on record. (See “ A Remonstrance of Piety and Innocence,” 1683. Dodd’s History, vol. iii., p. 356.) And if ever a man, may be believed to speak with sincerity, it is when, in the full possession of his senses, he stands on the brink of eternity, and expects the next moment, to be presented before an Omniscient Judge. One of them, Lord Stafford, referred the Peers, at his trial, for an account of his religious creed, to a small tract, entitled “ Catholic Principles.” This small tract has often been printed, and was then, and is still, considered to convey an accurate notion of the Catholic faith. Well may Hume say, that “ this Popish plot, is an incident, which, for the credit of the nation, it were better to bury in eternal oblivion, but which it is necessary to perpetuate, both for the truth of history, and to warn, if possible, their posterity, and all mankind, never again to fall into so *shameful*, so *barbarous* a *delusion*.” (See Hume’s History.) And yet Oates was rewarded with appointments in the Royal Palace, and had £1200 a year assigned him, as the wages of his iniquity, and Bedloe £500 : and Oates was called “ the Saviour of the nation.”

But how did these wretches come off at last ? You shall hear again, from Mr. Macaulay. About seven years later, when the madness, and the delusion of the people, had passed away, it was

resolved, to bring these wretches, who had spilled so much blood, to their *own* trial. "Some of the wretches," (says Macaulay) "were already beyond the reach of justice. Bedloe had died in his wickedness, without one sign of remorse or shame. Dugdale had followed him to the grave, driven mad by the furies of an evil conscience, and with loud shrieks, imploring those, who stood around his bed, to take away Lord Stafford. (A Catholic Lord, whose life he had sworn away, seven years ago.) Carstairs, too, was gone. His end, was all horror, and despair, and with his last breath, he told his attendants to throw him into a ditch, like a dog, for that he was not fit, to sleep in Christian burial ground." Mr. Macaulay thus describes Oates' appearance, at *his* trial. "A few years earlier, his short neck, his legs uneven, as those of a badger, his forehead low, as that of a baboon, his purple cheeks, and monstrous length of chin, had been familiar to all, who frequented the courts of law. He had been the idol of the nation—men had uncovered their heads to him, and called him, the deliverer of his country. They *now* shuddered at the sight of the *hideous* features, on which *villany* seemed to be written, by the *hand of God.*" (See Macaulay's History of England.) Horrible as were the sufferings of Oates, they did not equal his crimes. Such, gentlemen, is a short, but true account of Titus Oates's Plot, and of his abandoned, and perjured accomplices. And yet, some have the audacity to throw this infamous plot, in the face of the Catholics, even at the present day. To such I would say, "you are either ignorant of history, or not; if you are ignorant of history, it is the part of a simpleton, to talk on subjects which he does not understand." But if you are acquainted with history, I beg to address you in the words of the poet—

"A moral, sensible, and well bred man,
Will not offend me, and no other can."

Gentlemen, I now appeal to you, if it is not evident from what I have advanced in the preceding pages, that the late crusade against Catholics, has been most unjust, and most cruel. If you will seriously, and coolly, and impartially consider what has been ad-

vanced, you must be convinced, that all your alarms, and those of many other Englishmen, are mere chimeras of your own imaginations. But if, to some of you, the above reasoning does not appear satisfactory, I am sure it will to every sensible and unbiassed Englishman. Englishmen, indeed, like all other nations, have *their faults*, and *their perfections*. In times of general excitement, and of public panic, nothing is too absurd, for their credulity. In the hour of excitement, and of public panic, *pigmies*, appear *giants* to them, and *mole-hills*, swell into *mountains*. Witness the late railway mania. This mania, spread like wildfire, through the higher, the middle, and even the lower classes, and threw the whole nation, into a fever of excitement. Before their excited imaginations, rose the golden dreams of their *six*, and *eight*, and *ten* per cent., of railways, as the *best* and *surest* investment for their property, in short, as the easiest and most direct means, of turning their mole-hills of money into mountains of gold. *In vain*, were Englishmen warned, and cautioned by *sensible*, and *thinking* persons, *against* these *golden* prospects of their excited imaginations. Convinced, they either *would not*, or *could not* be. But lo! the mighty bubble burst, and then, to their loss, and sorrow, they both *saw*, and *acknowledged* the *folly* of their former excitement, of their *railway golden dreams*.

Again, I say, when Englishmen return to their *cooler* moments, and *seriously* reflect, on all the *late hubbub*, about *Pope's Bulls*, and *Guy Fawkes*, and *Gunpowder Plots*, and *Catholic Mummeries and Superstitions*, I feel confident, they will verify the words of Dr. Hughes, the Catholic Prelate of New York, who lately preached in London, on his way to Rome. "I am sure (says this distinguished Prelate,) that this great, and liberal nation, (England) *will*, after this *temporary* excitement is *over*, *be ashamed* of their *present* conduct, and will be *astonished*, how they could *ever think*, of proposing any steps, which tended to *abridge*, the *liberty* of any portion, of their countrymen, and violate that freedom in religion, which *is their boast*. The (English) Ministry *cannot* go *one* step back, upon the track of *persecutions*, if they make but *one* step, in *that* direction, they will be *condemned*, by *every liberal minded*

man, and will be looked upon, with *contempt* by the *rest* of the nations of the *world*." (Dr. Hughes' Sermon. London, December 1st, 1850.)

Hence we find, that *most*, of the *great* and *enlightened* statesmen of *England*, always *boldly*, and *freely*, advocated the freedom, and liberties of the *Catholics*. *As long*, as we retain *any* respect for genius, and discernment, for Parliamentary eloquence, and political wisdom, the names of Pitt, and of Fox, of Burke, and of Windham, of Canning, and of Peel, will stand *foremost*, in the *public* estimation. These eminent statesmen, however they might *differ* on *other* subjects, concurred in supporting the *cause* of the *Catholics*. *Their's* was the conviction of *liberal*, and *enlightened* minds, who forgot the distinctions of *party*, in their *zeal*, to serve the cause of *justice*, and of *freedom*. Yes, they *well knew*, that the *British* Constitution, was *not* a constitution of *restraints*, and *penalties*, that it was *framed* to preserve the rights of *freemen*, that it was formed, for the *whole*, not for a *part*, and that it was destined, like the sun, to shed its benign influence *upon all*. And hence, they knew, that they could not *better* consult its *prosperity* and *stability*, than by fearlessly, and manfully battling, for *equal* rights, and *equal* justice to *all*.

Gentlemen, I must now beg leave to retire, as my presence is required, in a *more august* assembly. You know, your address to the Magistrates for calling a meeting, &c., was *headed* by certain Protestant Ministers, and you know also, that most of their fellow labourers in the vineyard, of the Protestant Church, have been most *active*, and *zealous* in the *late* crusade against the *Catholics*. Now, to pass over these reverend gentlemen with *silent* contempt, would be, in my humble opinion, an act of great *incivility*, and *disrespect* on *my* part; and which, *they* might perhaps consider, a *most extraordinary*, and *presumptuous* movement, on *my* part; I beg leave, gentlemen, therefore, to adjourn to this *august* assembly, and as I shall have to show these reverend gentlemen, what "an extraordinary and presumptuous movement," *their* Protestant Church, has been making, *for a long time*, on the *pockets*, and on the *intellects* of Englishmen, I shall be very glad, if

you will accompany me, and see verified the poetical words of my two texts, annexed to my first *little* address to you—

“ I would you had been there to see
How the light blazed up so gloriously.”

“ And then in naked majesty,
With brow serene, and beaming placid light,
Came truth.”

AN ADDRESS
TO THE
CLERGYMEN OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

“A marvellous project, (is) i'faith, and a merry jest withal !”

MOST REVEREND GENTLEMEN,

You cannot be *surprised*, that I have *not* taken my text from the *Scripture*, for many of you tell the people, that we *Catholic* Clergymen wish to conceal from the people that sacred volume. To have, therefore, taken my text from the *Scripture* for the *sake* of the *people*, would be like falsifying your words, and to have quoted it for your instructions, would have been most presumptuous on my part, as every one knows you are masters of Israel, both in word and deed, in the knowledge of that sacred volume. Had I, therefore, been so presumptuous as to have quoted Scripture for *your* information, you might have perhaps addressed me in the words of the Poet—

“Ye Popish blockheads, mitred Cambridge cries,
Begone ; I and my friends alone are wise,
Rich with the spoils of Babylon, 'tis fit
That *we* should claim monopoly of wit.”

Well, among the great diffusion of biblical knowledge, which has been so *gloriously* spread among the people by your Scriptural Church, as by Law established, I happened one day *fortu-*

nately to hear, that you Reverends often told the people, that there was a golden and heavenly rule in the Scriptures, viz. :— that they were never to do unto others, what they would not wish others to do unto them. Now we cannot for a moment suppose, that like spiritual guide-posts, you would wish to inculcate this golden rule to others, and not follow it yourselves. Well then, you have been lately trying to arouse the indignation of the people, by informing them in the most dignified manner, that the Pope of Rome has just made a most “extraordinary, and presumptuous movement” on the Protestants of England. Now what shall we say, if it turn out, that you and your Reverend Protestant ancestors, have for a long time been making a “most extraordinary, and presumptuous movement” on the pockets, and on the intellects of Englishmen?

Let us then proceed to examine coolly, and calmly, the above points. I will endeavour, most Reverend Gentlemen, to discuss these points with as much temper, and forbearance as I possibly can. But, you must remember, that you and many of your Reverend body, have been endeavouring to convict, without ceremony, the numerous and respectable Catholic body of England, of the crimes of wishing to extend their popish spiritual and temporal domination over the Protestants of England. For this purpose, your zealous and Reverend body have, with pious industry, raked together the filth of ancient controversy, and poured it without mercy on the heads of Catholics, and on that Church, of which it is my pride to be a minister. Now, Reverend Gentlemen, you, who deal so copiously in hard words, certainly ought not to complain, if you should happen sometimes, to meet with them in return. If you demand respect from others, you ought certainly to respect a more numerous body of Christians, (I mean the Catholic Christian world,) who have no reason to think themselves, your inferiors in talent, learning, or judgment. Well then, let us now proceed to the discussion of the above two points.

Most Reverend Gentlemen, in a book (but mind not the Scripture) called the extraordinary Black Book, published in London in the year 1831, by Effingham Wilson, Royal

Exchange, I find the following statement of the income of the Church of England as by Law established. Of course, I am aware, that certain changes have been made by Government (since the publication of the above book) as to the amount of individual incomes, but the *aggregate* sum is still absorbed by the Protestant Church, as by Law established. Well then, in the above-mentioned, extraordinary Black Book, I find the various incomes of the Church of England there stated, and would you believe it! they form a sum of money, TO THE TUNE of nine millions, four hundred and fifty-two thousands, five hundred and sixty-five pounds per annum.

Now let us see, how well the Bishops, and Archbishops of the Reformation, have thriven on the above *spiritual* food. The following is an extract from the probate duty returns, and of course, must be *real* testimony as to the *worth* of these *poor in spirit* children, when they awoke "in that undiscovered country, from whose bourne no traveller returns."

EXTRACT FROM PROBATE OF WILLS.

	£
Stopford, Bishop of Cork, left his family ...	25,000
Percy, Bishop of Dromore	40,000
Cleaver, Bishop of Ferns	50,000
Bernard, Bishop of Limerick	60,000
Knox, Bishop of Killaloe	100,000
Fowler, Archbishop of Dublin	150,000
Beresford, Archbishop of Tuam	250,000
Porter, Bishop of Clogher	250,000
Hawkins, Bishop of Raphoe	250,000
Agur, Archbishop of Cashel	400,000
Bishop Warburton	500,000

Now just add up the above items, and then, you will see that these *Protestant* Bishops and Archbishops, *after* maintaining themselves, their wives and families, left *behind* them, according to the probate duty returns, *no less than the enormous sum of two millions and seventy-five thousand pounds sterling*. Really, when these *mammon-godly* souls entered the gates of heaven, with all these paraphernalia of gold, how amazed must the celes-

tial inmates have been! They would wonder whence these *golden* spirits came, but of this they would be convinced, that they must have come from the land of the *living*, and had certainly *piously* reformed the words of the Scripture, "Blessed are the poor in spirit," and really verified the words of my text, "What a *marvellous* project is faith, and a *merry* jest withal!"

So far, Reverend Gentlemen, I think the people will begin to conclude, that your Reverend body has, for some time, been making a most "extraordinary and presumptuous movement" on the *pockets* of Englishmen, and would to heaven! I could stop here. But I must *now* show the people of England, that *your Protestant Church* as by Law established, is receiving more money by *four hundred and fifty-three thousands, five hundred and sixty-five pounds*, than all the other Christian churches in the *whole world*. The above *extraordinary* Black Book, gives a scale of the *comparative* expenses of the Church of *England*, and of all the other *Christian* churches in the *whole world*. Now by this scale, it is shown that the *total* income of all the Christian churches in the various parts of the world, is eight millions nine hundred and ninety-nine thousand pounds; and the above scale shows, that the income of the Church of *England*, is nine millions, four hundred and fifty-two thousands, five hundred and sixty-five pounds. Now, if you will just place the *smaller* of these under the *larger* number, and subtract the one from the other, you will see that the *income* of the *Protestant Church in England*, exceeds the total income of *all* the other *Christian* churches in the *whole world*, by *four hundred and fifty-three thousands, five hundred and sixty-five pounds*. Oh, mighty England! thou boastest, and *justly*, that thy majestic fleet rides on the waves, the triumphant mistress of the seas; and thou mayest also *as truly*, but not *so justly*, boast, that thy *Scriptural* Church, as by Law established, rides triumphant on the *golden* waves of *mammon*, and that she is *really* mistress of the world, in *point of mammon*; she is *truly* the *grand* and *golden* emporium of clerical incomes. Oh, how *justly* may the ministers of this Church, address her, as their golden calf, in these words of the Scripture,

“Where *thou* goest, *I* will go; and where *thou* lodgest, *I* will lodge; and *thy* people shall be *my* people.” (Ruth i. 16.) “Yea! and we will kill the fatted calf, and slay the rams, and make merry.” (Prov. v. 9.)

But you will reply, we got all this money from *you papists*. Yes, courteous clerks, to the *honour* of the Catholic Church be it said, that all this money was left by our *charitable* ancestors; and I will now judge you from *your own* mouths. *Mind and mark it well*, that in the *Catholic* times of old England, the above sums of money were divided into *three* parts: *one* for the maintenance of the clergy, the *second* for the repair of the churches, and the *third* for the support of the *poor*. In those good old *Catholic* times, there were no church-rates, nor poor-rates. But your *god-like* church as by law established, thought it more just, or at least *convenient*, to pocket *herself* the *whole* of the above sum, and to leave to the *public* the charitable office, of providing for the other *two* purposes. Really, Most Reverend Gentlemen, I candidly appeal to you, if this was not “a most extraordinary and presumptuous movement” of your clerical ancestors on the *pockets* of the people; and *really*, must not people of the *present* day think it “a most extraordinary and presumptuous movement” on the part of you Reverend Gentlemen, to continue these *pious* frauds, and *godly* practices of your ancestors? In *this*, at least, you *fully* observe the commands of the *Scripture*, “Remove not the landmark of thy forefathers.” Oh ye poor! (whom I sincerely love for the sake of my Saviour,) when I enter your hovels, where sickness, misery, and want meet together, and witness the scenes of distress that are passing there;—when I see a few handfuls of dying embers, that are calculated rather to starve you, than afford you the necessary comforts of warmth;—when I see the bed of wretchedness, on which you cast your wearied limbs;—when I view the tattered clothes, which scarcely cover you decently, much less protect you from the inclemency of the weather;—when I behold your pale and sickly countenances, that bespeak the poorness and scarcity of your food;—when I view your poor little children, begging in vain, with tears of

artless innocence, a morsel of bread to satisfy the cravings of hunger ;—when I witness scenes of this heart-rending description, (scenes which are not very uncommon now-a-days), the *charity* of our *Catholic* ancestors, and the *inhumanity* of *your* Church as by law established, rush vividly on my mind, and call to my recollection the words of our Saviour, “Come, ye blessed of My Father, possess ye the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. For I was hungry, and you gave me to eat ; I was thirsty, and you gave me to drink. I was a stranger, and you took me in ; naked, and you covered me ; sick, and you visited me ; I was in prison, and you came to me. Then he shall say to them also that shall be on his left hand : Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, which was prepared for the devil, and his angels. For I was hungry, and you gave me not to eat ; I was thirsty, and you gave me not to drink. I was a stranger, and you took me not in ; naked, and you covered me not ; sick and in prison, and you did not visit me. Then they also shall answer him, saying : Lord, when did we see thee hungry, or thirsty, or a stranger, or naked, or sick, or in prison, and did not minister to thee ? Then he shall answer them, saying : Amen I say to you, as long as you did it not to one of these least,” (namely the poor), “neither did you do it to me.” (St. Matt. xxv. 34 to 45.) Oh how *strikingly* does the *first* part of this sacred passage apply to *our charitable Catholic* ancestors ? But shall I apply the second part to *you*, or *your Protestant* ancestors ? Oh ! heaven forbid I should ! I say with the great St. Paul, I judge no man ; but charity for you, and the poor, induce me to entreat of you, and to ask of God to give you His grace, to commence a real reform in your *church property*, for the *sake* of the *poor*, and to restore to the *poor*, what your Protestant ancestors *so unjustly* took from them.

But you will perhaps reply, that all this church property, has been *justly* given to your Protestant Church, by the *law* of the *land* ; for as the law of the land, *justly* secures to the *landlord*, his *rents*, so the law of the land, *justly* secures to *your church*, the *tithes*. I answer, in the first place, that by no law, either

human, or divine, can property be *justly* applied to any *other* purpose, than to *that* for which the *intention* of the testator left it. Now one-third of this church property, was left by our *Catholic* ancestors, for the support of the *poor*; and *as long* as this property, was in the hands of the *Catholic Church*, the poor always received *their just share*. Hence, among *all* the calumnies against the *Catholic Church*, even her *basest* enemies, could *never* accuse her of *injustice to the poor*. I answer secondly, the law of the land, as to *landlords*, is a *good law*, because the landlord gives to his tenant *value* (viz., the use of the land) for what he (the landlord) receives; whereas the law of tithes is a *bad law*, because it often exacts tithes, where the payer has never received, *one farthing* of value from the *parson*. Now in this case, it does appear to me (and I am sure it must to many others) most unjust to demand it *from persons*, who never received a *pin's-worth* of good, from *your* ministry in their lives. Nay, perhaps the *only return* they got, for the payment of their tithes was, to hear their religion *abused*, and to be held up before the public, as guilty of those *very crimes*, which *these* reverends *themselves* were *really* committing, either by their robbing the poor of their just share, or by unjustly exacting from *others* money, for which the *payers* had never received one farthing of value.*

* In the preceding pages, I have asserted, that the Protestant Church, is unjust, in taking from the poor their portion of church property, which was left them by our charitable Catholic ancestors; nay, that it is also unjust, to exact tithes from those, who do not belong to the Protestant Church of England. Now this bold assertion against the Protestant Church, certainly requires a little explanation. A law may be considered in *two* points of view, as a law of the *land*, and as a law of *God*. Now as the law of tithes in the Protestant Church, is sanctioned by act of parliament, of course the Protestant Church, is justified in exacting these tithes, for it has the law of the land at *its back* in this respect. But then, the Protestant law of tithes, considered in a *moral* point of view, is certainly an unjust law. And why? Because it takes from the poor, what was *justly* left them by our charitable ancestors, and it exacts money from the Catholics and dissenters, without doing any thing to them *in return* for this money. Thus you see, that the law of *man* and the law of *God*, sometimes *contradict* each other; and this is *often* the case, in your scriptural Church as by law established. But is not *God* always above *man*? Certainly; and therefore the *law of God*, ought *always* to

And now, most Reverend Gentlemen, I must just let the people see, how you contrive to blind them, by throwing *popish* dust into their eyes. All the noise, which you make, *about the pope's bulls, and about popish spiritual and temporal domination*, is a mere *ruse de guerre* of many of you, (some of you indeed, I believe, are sincere in your motives, and actions,) to divert

have the preference to the *law of man*. But this subject of Church tithes, reminds me of the famous Dr. Hook of Leeds, who is *often writing* against the Roman Catholic Church, but slyly *never* condescends to *answer* any of her replies. Now, *mark well*, I am going to prove, *even to a demonstration*, from the words of Dr. Hook, that the Roman Catholic Church, is *really the true Church of Christ in these realms*. Well, you will say, if you can do that, Dr. Hook must be a *very strange* and *inconsistent* doctor of our Church. Really, do you know, I was just thinking the same. In the year 1832, the Somerset County Gazette informed the public, that Dr. Hook, in a sermon which he preached *before the Queen*, uttered the following *remarkable* words: "Were all connection between church and state, at this very moment to cease, the church (that is, the Protestant Church) would remain *precisely* as she *now* is; that is to say, "our bishops, though deprived of *temporal* rank, would still exercise all those *spiritual* functions which, conferred by higher than human authority, no human authority can take away; still to vacant sees they would consecrate new bishops, still ordain the clergy, still confirm the baptized, still govern the church." Such are the famous words of Dr. Hook, in his sermon before the Queen. Now let us see how *nicely*, they *prove* the *Roman Catholic Church*, to be the *true Church of Christ* in these realms. Whether this prophecy of Dr. Hook respecting the *Protestant Church*, would be *really* verified, were his church to be *separated* from the state, I will not here enquire; but *this* I will say, it has been already really verified with regard to the *Catholic Church in England*. For although at the Reformation, the *Catholic Church* was deprived of all aid from the state, although she was unjustly spoiled of those temporal riches left by her charitable children, and although the exercise of her faith, subjected her followers to the most *severe pains* and *penalties*, (which must be for ever a disgrace to this country), still, Catholicity could not be extinguished in these kingdoms; for her bishops "*still continued* to exercise all those *spiritual* functions, which, conferred by *higher* than *human* authority, no human authority can take away, *still*, to vacant sees, they consecrated new bishops, *still* ordained the clergy, *still* confirmed the baptized, *still* governed the church." And hence this *Catholic Church*, notwithstanding all the *stormy trials*, which she has undergone *in England*, exists now, and is exactly the same in spiritual power, as she was before the time of the Reformation. If, therefore, Dr. Hook considers that *this* would be a *mark* of the *true Church of Christ*, were it to be *verified* with regard to his *Protestant Church*, we may *justly* infer, according to the *Doctor's* principle, that the *Roman Catholic Church*, is the *true Church of Christ in these realms*. And why? Because the doctor's principle, has been *already really verified*, with

public attention, from the *great temporalities* of the established Church. You call, and hold your public and glorious meetings. With upturned hands and eyes, with high-souled strains of *devotional* eloquence, with cordial community of feeling, got up between the *established* Church, and *those* whom you indeed honour *with your lips* by the title of reverends, but whom, in *your hearts*, you deem *mere phantoms* of ministers, with silvery tones, and well-turned periods, of *rag-tag* and *bob-tail* inspirations; you excite the breathless attention of your audience, and profess the *most sanctified* attachment to your *godly* Church, and to your glorious Constitution, under the protection of whose wing, *you are slyly* basking in the sunshine of *godly* mammon, and *worldly* wealth. Should any poor *Catholic*, or *charitable dissenter*, (who wishes *you to do to others as you would be done by*,) obtrude himself on the notice of your meeting, a thundering phillippic is *instantly* raised against *popery*, and gaining strength and speed, and loudness in its progress, rumbles onward, until at last, it bursts forth into a *tremendous* elemental roar, increased by the zealous acclamations of an enraptured and fanatical audience. Oh, most Reverend Gentlemen, this is really a *glorious*, and *very profitable* humbug. *As long as you can manage*, to keep the people in *this feverish state of excitement*, the gulls will think more of *discussing pope's bulls*, *Guy Fawkes's*, and

regard to *this church* in these kingdoms. Really, I begin to think that the *famous* Dr. Hook of Leeds, must be some relation to Martin Luther; for Martin, *even after* he had left the Catholic Church, proves, in the following words, that the *Roman Catholic Church*, was the *true Church of Christ*. In his book against the Anabaptists, he makes the following *candid* confession: "Under Papacy are many good things; yea, *everything* that is *good* in christianity. I say, moreover," continues he, "under Papacy is *true* christianity even the *very kernel* of christianity." Here we have two doctors of the Protestant Church, leaving, *even after* they had strained every nerve to *overturn* this Catholic Church, we have, I repeat, these two Protestant doctors, leaving in their writings to posterity, *one* by his line of *argumentation*, and the *other* by his *own* words, the most incontestible proofs that the Roman Catholic Church, is *really* the *true Church of Christ*, and that her fabric, is adorned with all the rich treasures of christianity. O how true is the declaration of the wise man! (Prov. xxi. 30,) "there is no wisdom, there is no prudence, there is no counsel against the Lord."

Gunpowder Plots, than of *questioning* the *moral* basis of the law, which entitles you to take from *the poor*, their *just* share of *Church* property, left by *our charitable* ancestors, and of exacting tithes and Church-rates from *those*, who do not belong to *your flock*, and for whom you do *nothing* in return. Thus, you *successfully* stave off the *discussion* of *Church* property, professing all the while, the most *devotional* concern for the *spiritual* welfare of *the gulls*, on whose *pockets*, you are making a most 'extraordinary, and presumptuous movement.' Thus you reap the *profits*, and *laugh* at the *fools*, who are *cajoled* by your *grand* displays. Really, most Reverend Gentlemen, this extraordinary and presumptuous conduct, does, in my humble opinion, *beat all the powers of impudence*.*

Most Reverend Gentlemen, I have now proved "the extraordinary and presumptuous movement," which *your scriptural* Church as by law established, has been making for a long time on the *pockets* of Englishmen. I must now proceed to show, what "a most extraordinary and presumptuous movement" she has been making for a long time, on the *intellects* of Englishmen. Would to God that occasion had never been given to me to touch on *this* subject! But remember, that *many* of your *reverend* body, have been *publicly* advancing the most *pretty*, and

* Joseph Hume, Esq., is, or nearly I believe, the oldest member of the present House of Commons, and it may be *truly* said, that, perhaps, no one in that House has acted with *greater* consistency, and more *disinterested* zeal, for the promotion of the welfare of his country. He has *always* been a staunch advocate for reform, a patriot for the rights of the poor, and a manly defender of civil, and religious liberty *to all*. Hence, poor Dan. O'Connell, was sensible of the *distinguished* political merits of this *great*, and consistent statesman; and hence, when an *English* constituency rejected this worthy member from a seat in the House, Dan. *honourably* obtained in *Ireland* a seat for *this useful* and consistent member. Now, I am glad to find, that the *remarks* which I have just made, agree with the opinion of *this eminent* statesman, *respecting the loaves and fishes of the protestant clergy*. The following, are the words which Joseph Hume, Esq. has *just* uttered on this subject: "but their zeal (that is, the zeal of the protestant clergy,) against the Catholics, looks to me, to originate from *fear* of the *loaves and fishes*, which they now so *largely* enjoy for doing *little*, and in *many* cases *nothing* of public duty." (Joseph Hume's, Esq., letter to W. J. Cole, Esq., Lechdale, Gloucestershire, 24th Dec., 1850.)

polite things against us *Catholics*. The newspapers, will bear ample testimony to the *strange*, and *horrid* things, which *many* of your *reverends*, have *lately* uttered against the Catholic Church. Now, what they have in general uttered against us, is, *unfortunately*, not founded on *truth*; but mind, what I shall advance is *really true*, although *most awful*, nay almost incredible, had not your *Protestant* testimonies borne *ample* witness to it. Remember, also, that although Our Saviour was the *most* meek, and kind creature that the world *ever* beheld, *still*, when the *honour* of His Heavenly Father was *insulted* and *outraged*, He cast the buyers and sellers out of the Temple. Now, some of your reverend body, have, in my ideas, lately used all their endeavours to insult, and outrage the Catholic Church, which, I consider, the Temple of God. Pardon me, therefore, if I should with the spiritual arms of *truth*, (and I hope of *charity*), cast *them* out of that temple, and show the world, they had *better* have been in *their own* temple, and have tried to have reformed it, *before* they had endeavoured to turn masters of Israel, in their *neighbours'* temple.

But *this*, Reverend Gentlemen, I must say, that if the Catholic Church, had *no better* foundation than *declamation* against the *Protestant* Church, I would not be either a *minister*, or a *member* of it for a *single* day. But mind, the Catholic Church has both a *good* foundation, and can also show the *flimsy* texture of the *Protestant* Church, when *Protestant* ministers are so *imprudent* as to attack her.

Most Reverend Gentlemen, I can only say, had *you* remained quiet, *I* should have been *innocent* of the disagreeable task, of having to state the following *awful* facts. But as *you* have not, I can only add, I am *innocent* of the consequences, look *you* to them. I will not indeed exclaim, with the Scripture, "Its blood be upon you, and upon your children;" but I will rather say, in the spirit of charity, may it bring you, and your followers, to a serious consideration, and to a sense of duty. But some of you reverends will *perhaps* infer, from the awful truths which I shall advance, that I must believe that all, who are not of *our* communion, must go to hell. *Appalling sentence!* Christ certainly

has said, that he that will not hear the Church, is to be to us as a heathen and a publican (that is, excluded from our spiritual communion.) But Christ does not say, he will *go to hell*, much less, therefore, ought *I to rashly* condemn him. St. Paul, also, warns us to judge *no man*, for this good reason, because *we, also* shall have to stand before the tribunal of Christ. Far, therefore, be it from me to open the flood-gates of damnation, even on a *single* individual, much less on the *whole* body of our Protestant brethren. Although, therefore, I shall shortly advance truths, most awful, and almost incredible, still, let no one imagine, I mean anything PERSONAL. Oh, no, I will say with the poet—

“ Let not this weak unknowing hand,
Presume thy bolts to throw,
Or deal damnation round the land,
On all I judge thy foe.”

Well, then, let it be remembered, that I shall advance only undeniable facts, without intending to deal damnation *on you*, or on the *whole* Protestant body.

“ I (shall) only speak right on,
Yes, as you know me all, a plain blunt man,
That love my friends, and that they know full well,
Who gave me public cause to speak the truth.
I'll tell you *that*, which you yourselves *might* know.”

A certain Spanish chemist, thought that *God's* formation of his master, had not been executed in the most perfect, and durable manner; and this chemist had the audacious presumption to imagine, that if he demolished his master, he could raise him to life again, to a more perfect, and durable specimen of workmanship, than he was, when God first made him. For this purpose, this audacious chemist cut his master into pieces, and put the various parts into his sublimatory glass, with the design of raising his master again, by chemical operation, to a more durable, and perfect state of life than he was, when he was the handiwork of *God's* formation. Now, Most Reverend Gentle-

men, I will not apply this to your Church, but *this* I will do, I will show you what the Church *was*, and *is*, which the fathers of the Reformation wished first to demolish, on account of her imperfections, and then, to raise her again to a more perfect specimen of spiritual life; I will show the characters of these spiritual chemists; I will show you the wonderful works of their spiritual chemistry, and the wonderful spiritual works of their scriptural hands; and then, I will leave you, and others to judge, whether these first reformers, and these new soul menders, *did*, or *did not*, really imitate the strange, and presumptuous conduct of this Spanish chemist.

When God first created man, He imprinted on his heart the light of reason, which (whether aided by revelation or not, it is not necessary here to enquire) taught him his duty to his God, to his neighbour, and to himself. This light was also imprinted on the hearts of his descendants; but as man fell from God by sin, the light of this natural law was greatly impaired, both in the hearts of our *first* parents, and of all *their* descendants. The light of this natural law, though much impaired by Adam's fall, is, and ever has been, imprinted on the hearts of all, and is, and ever has been, the foundation of all moral rectitude. The imperfection of this natural law was, before our Saviour came, supplied by the aid of revelation, which Almighty God communicated to mankind, at various times, through His chosen servants. But at *last*, the Almighty was pleased to send His only Son from heaven to earth, to supply the deficiency of this natural law, and to teach mankind, in the most perfect manner, their duty to God, to their neighbour, and to themselves. Hence our Saviour beautifully says, "He came *not* to destroy the law, but to fulfil it," that is, He came to supply the imperfections of the natural law, caused by Adam's fall, and to teach us, in the most perfect manner, our duty to our God, to our neighbour, and to ourselves. Hence, for this purpose He became man, and united our humanity to His divinity. In this God-man, were concentrated all the treasures of divine wisdom and knowledge; and to this God-man, were given all power in heaven, and on earth. It is plain, therefore, as our Saviour

beautifully says, He came to be the way, the truth, and the life to all mankind ; that is, he came to be the way, by showing us the true way of heaven, which had been darkened, and obscured by the sin of our first parents ; He came to be the truth, by revealing to us those supernatural truths, which the natural law did not reveal, and by revealing to us more clearly those truths, which the natural law revealed only obscurely ; and lastly, He came to be our life, by communicating to mankind His graces, by which they were enabled to *practise* the truths, which this divine law *taught*, and thus, by the *knowledge*, and *faithful practice* of this divine law, to arrive at last at the kingdom of heaven. Hence, fully sensible of this truth, the Apostles are continually in the Scriptures reminding us, on *the one hand*, of man's fall, and the sad consequences of that fall ; and on *the other hand*, of our liberation from sin, and of the abundant blessings we have received, by redemption through Jesus Christ.

Now, that mankind *in every age*, might be partakers of these abundant, and spiritual blessings, Jesus Christ was pleased to found a Church, and to invest this Church with the same spiritual powers, which He had received from His heavenly Father. This Church, *through Jesus Christ*, was to be the *infallible* source of all spiritual knowledge, and of all spiritual grace ; in short, it was to be the *visible*, the *infallible*, and the *incorruptible* Church of all ages, with the world for its boundaries, and time for its duration.

I will now, give you a short description of this Church of Christ ; attend, and I will tell you, in as few words as I can, what this Church always *was*, and really *is*. Catholicity, or Christ's Church, began with our Saviour, received her mission, her powers, and her doctrine, from Jesus Christ. She has been distinguished in every age, for the unity of her faith, and the sanctity of her doctrine, for the universality of her extent, and the apostolicity of her origin. No *earthly* consideration, could ever induce her, to swerve *one iota* from the sacred deposit, and unity of faith, delivered to her by Jesus Christ. Hence, whenever she found any in her communion, either layman, priest, or bishop, or *even a whole nation*, wishing to *change*, or *add to*, or

diminish *one tittle* of the *faith*, delivered by her heavenly founder, she *at first*, like a tender mother, expostulated with them, appealed to the grounds and truth of her faith, and traced it to the mouth, either of our Saviour or His Apostles; but if they disregarded her tender expostulations, she then, as St. Paul did the incestuous Corinthian, cut them off from her communion, and showed them, when *her faith* was at stake, she feared neither the *frowns* of individuals, nor the *strength* of nations. Every article of her faith is so holy in itself, and so conducive to true holiness, that she challenges her greatest adversaries, to show the *smallest stain* in any part of what she *really* teaches, and the most convincing proof of their being *unable* to do so, is, that not daring to attack her *true* doctrine, they, by calumny and misrepresentation, lay things to her charge which she even *detests* and *condemns*.* And then, after combating a *phantom*

* I cannot help relating here a circumstance (I hope it is not foreign to the purpose) that happened to one of my acquaintance. He was travelling in a coach, in which were three other respectable passengers. Among other subjects, the conversation (as is often the case) turned on Catholics. One of the gentlemen, immediately commenced a philippic against the Catholics, and called them idolaters, superstitious, murderers, and many other *pretty* names. My acquaintance allowed the gentleman, to pour out his abuse for some time *without interruption*, and appeared much amused by his bold assertions, and flaming descriptions of the poor *deluded* papists. During the conversation, a person in liquor, rode up to the coach window, and began to annoy the passengers, by his yells and impertinent behaviour. My acquaintance immediately said to the gentleman, who was telling such pretty things about the Catholics, let us have this drunken man taken up, he has murdered two or three people. The gentleman replied, "Are you, Sir, *certain* that he has murdered two or three people? Can you *prove it*? Because it would be very *unjust* to take the man up, unless you could *prove* the crimes which you mention." "No," answered my acquaintance, "I am not certain. And let me ask you, if *you are certain*, that all the charges, which you have just brought against the *Catholics* are *true*? I am a Catholic, and must tell you they are *false*, and if *you* would only follow the advice, which you have just given *me* about this man, you would find the truth of what I say. If *you* would not wish *me* to accuse this man of a crime, which I am not certain he *has* committed, I beg that *you*, for the future, will *never* accuse the *Catholics* of charges, which *you* cannot *prove* to be true, and which, if *you* would only take the trouble to examine, you would find to be *absolutely false*." The gentleman looked *much perplexed*, and was so ashamed of himself, that he never spoke another word until they parted. The other two gentlemen *enjoyed the joke wonderfully*, and *laughed most heartily*.

of their *own* creation, exult in an easy and decisive victory. From the dawn of Christianity to the present day, there has not been a nation converted to Christianity, but what was converted by her zealous exertions, nor is there a religion under the sun except hers, that can prove that any of her members, were ever honoured on account of their virtues, and sanctity, with the name of saint. She can look back through eighteen centuries, and shew that the unity and sanctity of her doctrine, are the *very same* in the *nineteenth* century, as they were in the *first* century. She can trace a long succession of popes, even to the first pope, who was St. Peter. She can present you a long catalogue of learned and polite nations, of scholars, philosophers, and divines, of generals, statesmen, and princes, of saints, martyrs, and confessors, who looked upon her faith as their best inheritance, a treasure which they held more dear than life itself. In short, she can prove, that she is *now* that Church, which *our Saviour first* founded on a rock, against which, He promised, that the gates of hell should never prevail, and that He, and His Holy Spirit, should remain with it, teaching it all truth, *until the end of the world*. Hence, she has passed through the stormy trials of *eighteen* centuries, which would have long since shivered any *human* institution into atoms, and now stands forth, ever fresh and vigorous, in all her pristine strength, but silvered with the venerable hoar of ages.

This is a short description of the visible, infallible, and incorruptible Catholic Church of Christ; I will now show you how this Church was formed, and how it was to be perpetuated, *from age to age*, with the world for its boundaries, and time for its duration. The Prophet Daniel foresaw this Church, when he said (Dan. c. ii.), "The God of heaven should set up a kingdom, which should *never* be destroyed." And our Saviour (Matt. xvi.) informs us, that He is the maker and builder of this Church. Hence He assures us, that as He Himself was sent by His Heavenly Father to preach the Gospel (Luke iv. 18.), so He, also, sent His Apostles: as My Father hath sent Me, I also send you. (John xx. 21.) For this purpose He revealed to His Apostles *all* the divine truths which *He* had received. "All things," says

He, "whatsoever I have heard of My Father, I have made known to you." (John xv. 15.) He then gave them a commission, to teach *all* these truths to *all* nations. "All power," says He, "is given to me in heaven and on earth: go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, teaching them to observe *all* things whatsoever I have commanded you; and behold I am with you *all days, even to the end of the world.*" (Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.) But when our Saviour gave these commands to His Apostles, He at the same time, imposed upon mankind a strict obligation, to *hear* and *learn* His gospel from the Apostles. Hence He says to His Apostles, "He that heareth *you*, heareth *Me*, and he that despiseth *you*, despiseth *Me*, and he that despiseth *Me*, despiseth *Him* that sent me." (Luko x. 16.) But whilst our Saviour, imposes upon mankind the necessity of *hearing* His Apostles, he pledged His *infallible* word, that they should *never* lead the *people* astray, or teach any false doctrine. For this reason, He promises that He will send down His Holy Spirit upon the Apostles, to teach them all truth, that He and His Holy Spirit will remain with them *for ever*, teaching them all truth, and that the gates of hell shall not prevail against them. (John xv. Matt. xvi.)

That this *absolute*, and *infallible* authority of preaching and teaching, was not to be limited merely to the *persons* of the Apostles, nor merely to the *period* of their ministry, but was also to extend to *their* successors in office, and to *all future ages*, I will now prove. Our Saviour tells His Apostles, that they are to go, and teach *all nations*, and that He will be with them, *even until the end of the world*; and that the Spirit of truth, shall remain with them *for ever*. Now, as the Apostles, *did not teach all nations*, in their *own* persons, and were not to continue on earth, until *the end of the world*, it was manifest, that the commission was not to be confined to *their persons*, but was to be given to *their office*, that is, to them and their successors in office, who shall continue until *the end of the world*, to *complete* the great work of teaching all nations, which the Apostles *first began*. That this was *actually* the intention of our *divine Saviour*, we learn in positive, and distinct terms, from these words of St. Paul: "And He gave some apostles, and some prophets,

and other some pastors, and doctors for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the odifying of the body of Christ." "That henceforth we may be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the wickedness of men, by cunning craftiness, by which they lie in wait to deceive." (iv. 11, 14.) *Such is, most Reverend Gentlemen, and such always was, the visible, the infallible, and incorruptible Church of Christ, which was to be perpetuated from age to age, with time for its duration, and the world for its boundaries.*

Oh, but you will reply, this Church once fell into error, at least so say the first Reformers. If, most Reverend Gentlemen, I were to assert that *you* all once committed *murder*, you would very sharply ask, *when, where, and how?* And if I could not prove *when, where, and how*, I think you would deem me (and justly too) a very near relation to the father of lies. Now, your first Reformers *said*, indeed, that the Catholic Church once fell, but *most unfortunately*, they *forgot* to prove *when, where, and how*. As, therefore, these first Reformers, forgot to prove these *most essential* circumstances, you must excuse *us Catholics*, if we prefer *God's infallible* word, to the *mere ipse dixit* of these *first celestial* lights of the Reformation. You know God says, heaven and earth, *shall* pass away, but His word *shall not* pass away.

But you will, perhaps, answer, really they must have been *strange* beings to have *asserted*, that *God's infallible* Church had fallen, and *not* to have been able, or at least to have *forgotten*, to *prove* such a bold assertion. Do you know, I was just thinking the same; and, therefore, I beg to introduce a few of these beings to your notice: and I know *none*, that has a greater claim to our first notice, than Martin Luther, *both* for the *originality* of his spiritual doctrines, and for the *sublimity* of the *celestial* revelations, with which he was honoured. And *mind*, had not Luther and his disciples, left the most *incontestible* testimony of what I am about to advance, it would really have outraged and defied *all credibility*.

Well, then, know, and *never forget*, that Martin Luther, the

first luminary of the Reformation, had a conference *with the devil*, in which Martin assures us, that he was convinced by the *devil's powerful* argumentation, that the Popish Mass was a heap of idolatry. The following are the words of this angel of *light* on this subject: "Being awakened at midnight, the devil began to dispute with me, according to his custom. "Listen to me, Master Doctor," said he: "do you consider that, for fifteen years, you have said mass almost every day? What, if all this while, you have been guilty of idolatry, and, instead of adoring the body and blood of Christ, have adored only bread and wine?" I answered him, that I was a priest lawfully ordained by the bishop; and that having, from a principle of obedience, discharged my ministry with a sincere intention of consecrating, I saw no reason to doubt the validity of the consecration. "True," replied Satan; "but in the Churches of Turks and Heathens, is not everything done in an orderly manner, and in the spirit of obedience? Does that authorize their worship as orthodox, and perfectly correct? What, if your ordination were null, and your consecration as vain and useless as that of Turkish priests, in the exercise of their ministry, or of the false prophets under Jeroboam?" Here (adds Luther) I was seized with a violent sweat, and my heart began to beat in a strange manner. The devil is very artful in adjusting his reasoning, and he also pushes his arguments with great force; he has a voice, strong and rough, and is so pressing in his objections, one after another, as scarcely to allow you time to breathe. Hence, I can conceive, how it has repeatedly happened, that persons have, in the morning, been found dead in their beds. In the first place, he may suffocate them; he may also, by his method of disputing, cause such a trouble in the soul as to render her unable to make any further resistance, and thus she may be compelled instantly to leave the body; which has nearly been my own case, more than once."

After this preface, Luther mentions five reasons which the devil alleged against the sacrifice of the mass; reasons extremely frivolous in themselves, but which Luther considered of sufficient weight to justify his yielding to them, saying to those who

might blame his conduct, that "if *they* had heard the devil reasoning in the same forcible manner as *he* had done, they would take care not to appeal from his arguments to the practice of the Church, and the usages of antiquity, which would never satisfy them." This conference may be seen in three different editions of Luther's works, printed by the care of his disciples, viz., (Wittemberg, T. 7, p. 479. Jenæ, Ed. Germ. per Thomas, p. 82. Attenberg, T. 6. p. 86.)

Really, most Reverend Gentlemen, this is a very strange history. *Certain, however, it is, that Luther omits nothing* to persuade us of its truth: for he mentions the very words which the devil used, the tone of his voice, the nature of his arguments, the impression which the conference made on his body and soul, which sometimes follow from debating with this king of the lower regions.

After the death of Luther, his disciples, and especially Melancton, took care to insert the conference in the collection of Luther's works, printed in Latin at Wittemberg, and the writers of the Luthern and Calvinistic party agree, that it was *certainly the production of Luther*.* (Hospinian, par. 2. Hist. Sacramentariæ, p. 26, et. p. 131.)

Now Luther either *had* or *had not* this conference with the master of lies. If he *really had*, Luther ought to have known, that *such* a master was not very likely, to teach him anything *very good*, and that he was not a very *fit* person, to convince him of the idolatry of the mass. For if the mass, had *really* been idolatry, I think the devil, would *rather* have encouraged, *than* tried to overturn it. But if Luther *had not* this conference, then the ambition of Luther, for having wished to

* We read of the ancient prophets, whom God sent to reform the Jews that they began their prophecies by admonishing the people, that the Lord had spoken to them: "Hear, O ye heavens, and give ear, O earth, for the Lord hath spoken." Isai, c. i. v. 2. Whereas God has permitted that the doctrine of the Reformation, should have been originally announced to the world, by a man of insupportable pride, who disclaimed the authority, and doctrine of all Churches then upon the earth; who made no difficulty of acknowledging, that it was from *the devil*, he learned *one* of the principal articles of the Reformation, and who might therefore, have said to his followers, "Hear, O ye heavens, and give ear, O earth, for the *devil* hath spoken."

appear connected with so bad a master, indicates so strange and exotic a genius, so depraved and bad a taste, that it reflects *almost* as much dishonour on Luther, as if this conference had really taken place.

You will perhaps object "that Luther is nothing to us." Most Reverend Gentlemen, I have not quoted him to insult you, or to throw any disrespect on you; for *you* are certainly not to be *answerable* for Luther's *deeds*. But I have quoted him to let you see, what kind of a genius, this father of the Reformation was, and I must now candidly ask, if you think he was a *fit* person, to reform Christ's Church. Had he indeed begun, by endeavouring to *reform* the devil himself, we might have pardoned his religious enthusiasm; but for him to tell us, that the *infallible* Church of Christ, had fallen into error, and that he had come to reform it, under the instructions, and guidance of the master of lies, is *really* most outrageous, and cannot be equalled by any thing, that I have either heard, or read on this side the grave. That the human mind, should be capable of falling into such dreadful delusion, would appear almost incredible, had not the Holy Ghost assured us, that God abandons to a reprobate sense, those who wish to change *truth* into *falsehood*. (Romans i. 25-26.)

Zuinglius, another bright son of the Reformation, professes to have learnt his main argument against the Real Presence from a spirit, which appeared to him in the night, but whether it was a *black*, or *white* spirit he does not remember. However, he made great account, of this nightly instruction of his *unknown* friend; read the place of Exodus, which had been pointed out to him by his *unknown* friend, and afterwards preached before the whole congregation, on the subject of this *wonderful* discovery. (Hosp. ii. p. 25-26.) Luther was positive and sure, that the devil, whom Ecolampadius, (another reformer,) employed, strangled him during the night in his bed. "This is the excellent master," continues Luther, "who taught Ecolampadius that there are contradictions in the Scripture. See," says Luther, "to what satan brings learned men." (De Miss. Priv. Luth.)

Such were the nocturnal revelations, with which some of the first reformers were honoured, and I think now, you will not be

surprised at the following character, which is given *them*, and the *other* reformers, *even* by *Protestant* testimony. Zanchius, the celebrated Protestant professor, thus complains of the conduct of his *reforming Protestant* colleagues: "I am indignant, when I consider the manner, in which most of us defend our cause. The *true* state of the question we often, on *set* purpose, involve in *darkness*, that it may not be *understood*; we have the impudence, to *deny* things the *most evident*: we *assert* what is *visibly false*: the *most impious* doctrines, we *force* on the people as the *first* principles of *faith*, and *orthodox* (true) opinions, we condemn as *heretical*: we *torture* the Scriptures, until they agree with our *own* fancies, and boast of being the *disciples* of the *fathers*, while we refuse to *follow* their doctrines: to *deceive*, to *calumniate*, to *abuse*, is our *familiar* practice: nor do we care for anything, *provided* we can defend our cause, *good* or *bad*, *right* or *wrong*. Oh what times! what manners! (Zanchius ad Stormium, tome viii. col. 828.)

"But *forgery*—I blush for the *honour* of Protestantism while I write it—seems to have been *peculiar* to the *reformed* * * * and I look *in vain*, for one of these accursed outrages of imposition, among the *disciples* of Popery." "But *forgery*, appears to have been the *peculiar* disease of *Protestantism*."—(*Vindication of Mary, Queen of Scots*, vol. iii. p. 2 and 53. *By the Rev. John Whitaker, B.D., Rector of Ruan Langhorne, Cornwall.*)

You have now seen, who was the instructor of *some* of the first Reformers, and the two above passages (*mind, from Protestants,*) must convince you, that *they* and *their* reforming Protestant colleagues, appear to have been apt scholars of this master of lies. Well, I have shown you now, the character of the spiritual chemists of the Reformation. I will now show you, some of the wonderful *spiritual* works, of some of their *supernatural*, and chemical hands.

Among these, I must rank as *first* and foremost, the wonderful spiritual deeds, of your Scriptural Church as by Law established. Most Reverend Gentlemen, The Thirty-nine Articles, are the fundamental Articles of your Protestant Creed. Now, in the Thirty-fifth of those Articles, I find, that your

Scriptural Church professes to believe, in the Protestant homilies there named. Among which I find the second is, "against peril of idolatry." Now, the following, are the words of your Protestant homily against idolatry. Its words are these: "The preaching of God's word, most sincere in the beginning, by process of time became less and less pure, and afterwards corrupt, and last of all, altogether laid down and left off, &c. Not only the unlearned and simple, but the learned and wise; not the people only, but the bishops; not the sheep, but also the shepherds themselves, being blinded by the bewitchery of images, as blind guides of the blind, fell both into the *pit of damnable idolatry*; in which all the world, as it were drowned, continued unto our age for the space of eight hundred years; unspoken against in a manner, so that laity and clergy, learned and unlearned, of all ages and sexes and degrees, of men and women and children of whole Christendom, (an horrible thing to think,) have been at once drowned in abominable idolatry, of all other vices most detested by God, and damnable to men, and that for the space of eight hundred years together. And to this end has come that beginning of setting up of images in churches, then judged harmless, in experience proved not only harmful, but exitious and pestilential, and to the *destruction of all good religion universally*." Thus far, your Protestant homily.

Really, most Reverend Gentlemen, if in my comments on the above passage, I have often to use the word *damnable*, you must really *pardon* me, for you see, I have just been taught this *pretty* word, by your Scriptural Church, and you know, she is master in Israel. Pray, most Reverend Gentlemen, where was your Protestant Scriptural Church, during this *eight* hundred years of damnable idolatry? If it was a member of *no* Church, then, it was not a member, or part of *Christ's* Church. But if it was a member, or part of any *one* Church in *all* Christendom, then, it was utterly drowned in abominable, and damnable idolatry. I wonder how your Scriptural Church, can extricate herself out of this spiritual labyrinth.

Well, then, here we have, *according to your* Scriptural Church, a universal apostacy. The true Church decayed, the

whole of Christendom drowned in damnable idolatry, and all good religion destroyed *universally*, and *that*, for eight hundred years; and we have also *your* Scriptural Church either not existing, or buried in this universal spiritual destruction. Really, your Scriptural Church, Sampson-like, not only demolished the *whole* spiritual fabric of Christendom, but also perished *herself* under the ruins of this universal spiritual destruction; but the strangest thing of all is, whilst with *one* hand, she was endeavouring with her spiritual power, to hurl the Catholic Church, into the vortex of this universal spiritual destruction, she, with *the other* hand, charitably saves *us* Catholics (as Moses was saved from the waters) from this deluge of universal spiritual idolatry; and I will now show you how; for your Scriptural Church, in her sixth article of the Thirty-nine Articles, teaches that, "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation." Now, this very Scripture, (the book of salvation,) declares (as I have already shown in my above description of the Catholic Church,) that, the Catholic Church should *never* err, and of course, could *never* fall into idolatry. And, therefore, in obedience to your Scriptural Church, and to the Scripture itself, we believe that the Catholic Church, *never* has fallen, and *never will* fall into idolatry. For the Scripture says, "Heaven and earth *shall* pass away, but God's word, *shall not* pass away." Really, your Scriptural Church, is very kind to us in this respect, and I almost begin to think, she must be a worthy descendant of Pharo's daughter, who saved Moses from the waters of the Nile.

Well, Most Reverend Gentlemen, you see your scriptural Church, has now hurled the whole of Christendom, into the vortex of universal, abominable, and damnable idolatry, and either involved herself, in this sweeping deluge of abominations, or committed suicidal destruction on herself; but, *strange* to say, she has *charitably* saved us benighted Papists, from these abominable, and universal waters of idolatry, as Pharo's daughter, kindly saved Moses from the waters of the Nile. Now, *how* your scriptural Church as by law established will contrive to gather together again, and unite all the various parts of this

universal, spiritual edifice, just destroyed by her hands, I am at a loss to determine. If *she really can* collect, unite, and form these various spiritual parts, into a *more* perfect, and durable edifice, than *God Himself* had made it, I shall *then* begin to think, that she is invested with powers, which *even God Himself* does not possess. But by *what* spiritual art of chemistry, is she to perform this wonderful, and *superhuman* operation? If she has recourse to *the Scriptures*, she will *there* learn, that God had built this spiritual edifice on an *imperishable*, infallible, and incorruptible foundation. And surely, for her sake, God will not *contradict* Himself; and if she has recourse to her thirty-nine articles, they have already annihilated her. O poor scriptural Church! thou hast often made *sad* work with *other* Churches; but *at last*, alas! thou art in *sad* straits thyself. O! how thou remindest me of the man, who

“ Halting on crutches of unequal size,—
One leg by truth supported, one by lies,
Thus saddled to the goal, with awkward pace,
Secure of nothing but to lose the race.”

Well, but you will say, this immense spiritual edifice *must* for the sake of the *salvation* of mankind, be *re-built*. Should I offer *my officious* services, to assist in this pious work of reconstruction, your scriptural Church might perhaps say, I destroyed *more* than I built. Well, she could not, even then, justly complain of this; for *she* has *just* cut into pieces, demolished, and annihilated the *whole* of Christendom, with her destructive weapons of universal, abominable, and damnable idolatry.

In all *material* edifices, it is considered of the greatest importance that the *foundation* should be *firm*, *safe*, and substantial. Of course, we have reason to expect *these* requisites in the foundation of all *spiritual* edifices; and of course, we may *naturally* expect them, in the new erection of God's work which your Church has just destroyed, but which she is *now* going to re-construct into a *more* perfect and durable form than *God* had made it. Now, upon *what* foundation will your Church *reconstruct* this demolished spiritual edifice? In her twenty-first article of her thirty-nine articles, (and mind, she has sworn to these

articles as God's truth,) I find the following words: "General councils may not be gathered together without the commandment, and will of princes. And when they be gathered together, (forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed by the Spirit, and word of God,) they *may err*, and *sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining unto God.*"

Now, please tell me, Most Reverend Gentlemen, of *what* is your new spiritual Church to be built? Surely not of brick and mortar! but of course, it is to be erected, on the testimony of man, or of some body of men. But your article says, men may err, and *have erred, even in things pertaining to God.* Therefore, your council, or councils, of your new Church *may err*, and therefore, how will you build upon these *fallible* men an *infallible* foundation?

But you will indignantly reply, the article intimates, that they may err *unless* governed by the *Spirit*, and word of God. Well, Most Reverend Gentlemen, is it likely God will give *them* his Spirit, and unerring word to *reconstruct* a new Church, when they have just destroyed the infallible, and beautiful work of *God's own hands*? Is it in the nature of things, that *God* should *contradict* Himself, to second the BABEL ideas of your scriptural Church, yet to be formed?

Really, Sir, some of you Reverends will exclaim, *how* you are *garbling* that twenty-first article! Why have you *slyly* omitted to quote the *last* part of that article?—Well, as you have called, for the *last* part of this article, I will now quote it; and as your Church (*first*, indeed, unfortunately destroying herself) has just so charitably saved us, benighted papists, from the waters of idolatry, I do sincerely hope this *last* part of your article, may enable you, to *rebuild* a godly and spiritual edifice. Well, then, now for the *last* part of this twenty-first article, which you say, I have *slyly omitted*. It runs thus verbatim: "Wherefore, things ordained by them, as necessary to salvation, have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared, that they be taken out of Holy Scripture." Now, Most Reverend Gentlemen, as you have just asked *me* a question, allow *me* to ask *you another*. If any of you, were wishful to purchase an estate,

would you not *first*, have the title deeds of that estate, *carefully* examined by some eminent and respectable lawyers, *to be sure* that the title deeds, were perfectly good, and satisfactory, *before* you advanced the money? Now we have just learnt, from the *last* part of your twenty-first article, that the Scriptures, properly speaking, are the deeds of a *Christian*, by which he is to obtain a *good* title to salvation. Of course, therefore, we may *naturally* suppose, that your scriptural Church would hand down to her followers the Scriptures, in the *most perfect* and *unmutilated* state.

Well, we will now see whether she *has* done *this*, and *then* we shall be able to determine, if she can *rebuild* her godly, and spiritual edifice on so heavenly a foundation. We will now consider how she got the sacred Scriptures, after her shipwreck amid the perils of idolatry, and whether, *after* she got them, she handed them down to her followers in the perfect and unmutilated state, in which she *first* received them from the *Catholic Church*. Luther, the father of the Reformation, even after he had left the Catholic Church, candidly says, in his Commentary on the 16th chapter of St. John's Gospel: "We are obliged to yield many things to the Papists, that with them is the word of God, which *we* received from *them*, otherwise *we* should have known *nothing at all about it*." And, in his book against the Anabaptists, he makes the following confession: "Under Papacy are many good things, yea, *everything* that is *good* in *Christianity*. I say moreover," continues he, "under Papacy is *true* Christianity, even the *very kernel* of Christianity." From these two passages of Luther, it is evident, that your scriptural Church, *first* received the Scriptures from the *hand* of the *Catholic Church*, and that she received them, in a *perfect* and *unmutilated* state; otherwise, how could Luther's words be true, (and *mind*, he uttered these words *after* he had left the Catholic Church) when he assures us, that under Papacy is "true Christianity, yea, everything that is good in Christianity, nay, the *very kernel* of Christianity."

Now let us see *how* your scriptural Church, corrupted and mutilated the sacred volumes which she had received from the Catholic Church in a *perfect* and *unmutilated* state.

Luther was the first, after the Reformation, who put out a Protestant translation of the Scriptures, which was *immediately* condemned by Osiander, Rickerman, and Zuinglius. Of this translation of Luther, Zuinglius says, (Lib. de Sacra.) "Luther was a foul corrupter, and horrible falsifier of God's word. One, who followed the Marcionites and Arians, that razed out such places of Holy Writ, as were against him. Thou dost," says he to Luther, "corrupt the word of God. Thou art seen to be a manifest, and common corrupter, and perverter of the holy Scriptures. How much are we ashamed of thee, who have hitherto esteemed thee!" But Luther not only falsified, but he also added, to the texts of the Scripture. "I know well," says Luther, "that this word, alone, (which he added to St. Paul's words, Rom. iii.) is not found in the text of St. Paul, but should a Papist, annoy you upon it, tell him at once, without hesitation, that Dr. Martin Luther, would have it so, and that a papist, and an ass, are synonymous." (Tom. 5, Jena Edit. p. 141, 144.)

But Luther, soon had an opportunity of retaliating, on his disciple Zuinglius. When Proscheverus, the Zuinglian printer of Zurich, sent him a copy of the Zuinglian translation, Luther rejected it, and sent it back to him, calling at the same time the Zuinglian divines, in matters of divinity, "fools, asses, anti-christs, deceivers, and of an ass-like understanding." (See Zuing. tom. 2, ad Luth. Lib. de Sac. fol. 338.)

Of the translation set forth by Œcolampadius, Beza says, that it "is in many places wicked, and altogether differing from the mind of the Holy Ghost." And he also condemns that of Castalio, as being sacrilegious, wicked, and heathenish. (In Respons. ad Defens. and Respons. Castal.)

We should naturally expect that Beza, after thus reproving the translations of Œcolampadius and of Castalio, would *himself* have produced an immaculate one; but the learned Molineus observes of his translation, that "he (Beza) actually changes the text, of which Molineus gives several instances." (In sua Translat. Nov. Testi. part 20.)

Castalio wrote a whole book against Beza's corruptions of the Scriptures, and yet, he adds, "I will not note all his (Beza's)

corruptions, for that would require too large a volume. — In Defens. Transl.)

Of Calvin's translation the learned Molinæus thus speaks: "Calvin, in his harmony, makes the text of the Gospel to leap up and down. He uses violence to the letter of the Gospel; and besides this, adds to the text." (In sua Translat. Nov. Test. part 12.)

Here, then, you have Zuinglius and others against Luther's translation, and Luther against Zuinglius's translation, Beza against Œcolampadius and Castilio's translation, and Castilio against Beza's translation, and Molinæus against Calvin's translation. Now, which of all these false translations was your scriptural Church to adopt as her only rule of faith and for that of the people? Why, you Reverends will reply, she was to adopt her *own* English translations.

Well, then we had better examine, and see whether they were any better than *any* of the above translations. Carlile, in his treatise on Christ's descent into hell, says of the English translators, that they have "depraved the sense, obscured the sense, obscured the truth, and deceived the ignorant; that in *many* places, they do detort the scriptures from the *right* sense, and that they show themselves to love darkness more than light, falsehood more than truth." And in an abridgment which the ministers of the diocese of Lincoln delivered to King James, they denominated the English translation, "A translation that taketh away from the text, that addeth to the text, and that sometime to the changing, or obscuring of the meaning of the Holy Ghost; a translation which is absurd and senseless, perverting, in many places, the meaning of the Holy Ghost." Burges, in his Apology, sec. 6, exclaims, "How shall I approve under my hand a translation, which hath so many omissions, many additions, which sometimes obscures, sometimes perverts the sense, being sometimes senseless, sometimes contrary?" And Broughton, in his letter to the Lords of the Council, gives this reason for requiring a new translation without delay, that "That which is now in England is full of errors." And, in his Advertisement of Corruptions, he tells the bishops, "That their public translations of

Scriptures into English is such, as that it perverts the texts of the Old Testament, in eight hundred and forty-eight places; and that it causes millions of millions to reject the New Testament, and to run to eternal flames."

But some of you Reverends may reply, those were the Protestant translations of *earlier* times; but we have got *better* translations now. Well, then we must now examine the truth of your assertion. In November, 1822, the Irish Protestant Society passed the following condemnatory resolution of the Irish translators: "Resolved, that, after a full enquiry, the members of this society feel satisfied, that material and very numerous errors, exist in the version of the New Testament, edited by the British and Foreign Bible Society." According to Mr. Platt, thirty-five variations were discovered in the first ten pages, of which seven were considered to be material, "This proportion in a Testament of four hundred pages," says the Hon. and Rev. Mr. Percival, "gives fourteen hundred variations, and two hundred and eighty material errors in a single volume." We find in the Monthly London Review, page 220, "That in April, 1832, a memorial was addressed on the subject, to the vice-chancellors of the Universities of Cambridge and of Oxford, and the other delegates of the Clarendon press. It was signed by the following gentlemen :

T. Bennet, D.D.	T. Fletcher, D.D.
T. Blackburn.	E. Henderson.
George Collinson.	J. P. Smith, D.D.
F. A. Cox, L.L.D.	T. Townley, D.D.
Thomas Curtis.	R. Winter, D.D.

The names, attached to this memorial, are too respectable not to communicate a great degree of importance, to any statement to which they are affixed. This memorial states, "That the modern Bibles, issued from the press of the University of Oxford, abounded with deviations from the authorized version of King James the First. That, though some of these errors were merely typographical, yet of those that were intentional, the number was of a serious amount. That in the Book of Genesis, there were

upwards of eight hundred errors ; in the Psalms, six hundred ; in the Gospel of St. Matthew, four hundred and sixteen ; and in about the fourth part of the Bible, an aggregate of two thousand, nine hundred and thirty-one."

The same Monthly London Review, for February, 1833, speaking of the pamphlet of Thomas Curtis, of Grove House, Islington, on his discoveries of the falsification of the Bible, says : " In this comparatively brief pamphlet, we find the exposition of one of the most singular deceptions, to which the world has yet been exposed. The imposition, is nothing short of a downright falsification of the text of Scripture. Need we add a syllable more, to rouse the attention of the thinking community ?" In the same pamphlet Mr. Curtis remarks : " About twenty years ago, an intelligent reader at one of the printing offices, where the Bible was in a course of printing, took the trouble of drawing up a specification of a number of gross errors, which he found in the very copy, *that had been selected by the proper authorities*, as the *standard* of correctness to which he was to adhere. The errors pointed out by the penetrating reader, amounted to no less, than seven hundred and thirty-one, and these occurred in the various chapters, from the beginning of Genesis, to the end of Jeremiah.

Well, most Reverend Gentlemen, it is plain from what I have stated (and where is the person who can contradict what I have stated), that the *first* Protestant foreign Reformers, corrupted and falsified the sacred Scriptures, that your English Protestant Reformers, did also the same, and that even at the present day, your English Protestant translations of that sacred volume, are in a most awful and corrupt state. And would to heaven I could stop here !

But what will the English people say, when they learn, that your Protestant scriptural Church, has *not only* falsified and corrupted the Scriptures, but that she has had the audacity, to expunge from the canon of the Scripture many books, which are *as much canonical* (that is, as much the inspired word of God) as those, which she still retains in her present Protestant canon. I will now prove this. The Protestant Church, received at first (as Luther truly informs us) the Scriptures from the Catholic

Church. The Catholic Church, therefore, must be good authority in this respect, otherwise how can the Protestant Church be, sure that her first Scriptures, were the real word of God? Now, the Catholic Church has ranked, for at least fourteen hundred years, many books as *canonical*, which your Protestant Church rejects as *uncanonical*. In the year 397, a Catholic council was held at Carthage, at which the learned and pious St. Augustine assisted. In that council, the canon of the Scripture, was satisfactorily determined; and in that very council, many books were declared to be *canonical* (that is, the inspired word of God,) which your Church, has had the audacity to tell the people, are *not canonical*, that is, they are not to be considered the inspired word of God. But *what* reason had your scriptural Church, to assume the audacious power, to condemn as *uncanonical*, books, which were declared by this illustrious, numerous, and learned body of Christians, *to be canonical*, (that is, the inspired word of God?) I ask you, *what* reason had your scriptural Church for this *audacious* step? I answer, none. O but I fancy I hear some of your reverends exclaiming, You are wrong *for once*, old papish botheration. Look at the passage in the sixth of our articles, between *our canonical* and *uncanonical* books, and there you will find a good reason for your *popish* question.

Thank you, courteous clerks; I will now quote the passage, and give *your* scriptural Church the benefit of it. "And the other books (as Hierome saith) the Church doth read, for example of life, and instruction of manners, but yet doth it not apply them to establish any doctrine." (Art. 6, Ch. Eng. P. Book.) Well, most Reverend Gentlemen, *truth* and *falsehood* are in this passage, mixed up together *to a nicety*. In the first part, your scriptural Church tells the people that she, like Hierom (and mind, St. Hierom was a great Catholic Saint), reads her *uncanonical* books, for example of life and instruction of manners. Well, *her object* for reading these books, as far as it goes, is very good; but then, your scriptural Church *slyly* adds, "but yet doth it not apply them *to establish* any doctrine:" an artful inuendo that St. Hierom did the same. Now St. Hierom wished,

indeed, the Catholic Church to read these books, for example of life, and instruction of manners; but St. Hierom, at the same time, included in the Catholic canon *all* the books, which had been ranked in the Catholic canon by antiquity. Now, if your scriptural Church, quoted St. Hierom's authority in confirmation of the *first* part of this passage, why does she slyly intimate, to follow him in the *second* part, where she contradicts St. Hierom, by asserting that certain books of the Scripture, are *uncanonical*, which St. Hierom believed, and taught were *really canonical*? Come, Reverend Gentlemen, your Church *must* have had some *sly* reason, for this *contradictory* conduct. Now, *do* tell us *what* this reason was. Well, if *you* will not tell, *I* must.

You have seen, how the first reformers *falsified* the Scriptures, to make the sacred text, harmonize with their *reformed* ideas; but *what* puzzled them *most* was, they found there were certain books, which they could not *possibly* tune to their *new* ideas. They *durst* not indeed, *entirely* reject these sacred books; for they knew in *what* veneration, they had been *always* held by *antiquity*; but on the *other* hand, they *durst* not admit them as *canonical*; for *then*, the *testimony* of these books, would upset their *new-fangled* ideas; they thought, therefore, the *most convenient* method, was to make *flesh* and *fish* of them, and *then*, they could either *admit*, or *contradict* them, according to their *own spiritual convenience*.

And that I am speaking the truth, I will give you *one single* instance, and from this *one*, you will be able to judge of the *rest*, of their *sly* method, of squaring the scripture to their *new*, and *reforming* ideas. Of all the tenets of the Catholic creed, there is *none*, that has been *more lustily* inveighed against, and accordingly, *none* that sound so *awfully*, to an *English Protestant* ear, as Purgatory, and Prayers for the dead. (*O keep your seats, Most Reverend Gentlemen, I am not going to put you into Purgatory, although you may imagine it smells very strongly of it on this side the grave.*)* Well, mind this doctrine of Purgatory,

* But some will perhaps ask, why did the *first* reformers inveigh so *much* against *Purgatory* and *Prayers for the dead*? Why the first reformers liked *spiritual commerce*, *without* duty if they could only contrive it, Now, as a

and of Prayers for the dead, was the belief of the Jews, and of all the first Christians, and continued even to the time of the Reformation. Now in the book of *Machabees*, this doctrine is so *plainly* laid down, that no man in his senses, can contradict it. Read the following passage, and tell me, if I am not speaking the truth. "And making a gathering, he (Judas Machabeus) sent 1200 drachms of silver to Jerusalem for sacrifice, to be offered for the sins of the dead, thinking well, and religiously, concerning their resurrection. (For if he had not hoped that they that were slain, should rise again, it would have seemed superfluous, and vain to pray for the dead.) And, because, he considered that they who had fallen asleep with godliness, had great grace laid up for them. It is, therefore, a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from sins." II. Mac. xii. 43-46.

Now this passage was so *clear*, and *positive* a proof of purgatory, and of prayers for the dead, that the first Reformers found, that they could not get rid of it, *without denying the divine* authority of the book. *Accordingly*, these new soul-menders, told the people that the two Books of Machabees, were not included in the Jewish Canon, but *unfortunately*, they *forgot* to tell the world the *reason*, (*viz.*,) because the Jewish Canon was compiled by Esdras, *long before* the Books of Machabees were written. And now,

remuneration for Prayers for the dead, our charitable ancestors had left certain handsome sums of money; now these reformers liked the *money*, but *not the obligation* of the Prayers; and, therefore, they inveighed *right lustily against* the Prayers, but took care to slyly pocket the money. But when this spiritual commerce could *not* be carried on unless the duty was *performed*, they very kindly retained the popish practice, and thus secured the money; witness the tolling of the bell for persons *just* dead, the churching of females, and of burying the dead. These and other are in reality the remnants of popish ceremonies, and the performance of them inspire on the *Catholic* mind *devotional* feelings; but by Protestants are, *in general*, looked upon very lightly, in a *spiritual* point of view. But then take away these popish ceremonies, and off flies the fee. Will the fee for baptism be now demanded, as baptism has been *lately* declared to be an unnecessary act of religion in the Protestant Church? Our Saviour said to His Apostles, "Go, teach all nations, *baptizing* them," (that is, all nations,) but the Protestant Church says to her ministers, "Go teach all nations," but as to the *absolute necessity* of baptism, our Saviour *must* have been wrong, and, therefore, go please yourselves about it.

you may understand the *sly* words of your sixth article, "but yet it doth not apply them (these books) to *establish any doctrine,*" viz., to establish the *Catholic* doctrine, and to *overturn their new-fangled* ideas.

Now, Gentlemen, is it not plain that your Church, hath *both corrupted* the Scriptures, and expunged from her *Protestant Canon*, many of the *inspired* books of those sacred volumes?

And now, allow me to quote the *first* part of the sixth Article of your Church, and then, tell me *what* the *people* are to do, to save their souls, and how your Scriptural Church, *is ever* to be raised again, to a new spiritual life. "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that, whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be approved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an Article of the Faith, or to be thought requisite or necessary to salvation. In the name of the Holy Scripture, we do understand those Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church."

Now this part of your Article, assures us, in the strongest manner, that the Holy Scriptures, contain all things necessary for salvation, that they are the sure palladium of a Christian, and his title-deeds to eternal life; and it also says, that in this sacred volume, are to be included all the books of whose authority, was never any doubt in the Church. Now, it is also plain from what I have advanced, (and find me a person who can overturn by *solid* argument what I have advanced,) it is plain, I repeat it, that your Church has *both* falsified the text of the Scripture, and expunged from her *Protestant Canon*, many books, whose authority and divine inspiration, were held by antiquity in the greatest veneration. Now, most Reverend Gentlemen, do tell me what the people are to do. On the *one* hand, your Church tells the people, there *is no* salvation *without* the Scripture: and on the *other* hand, your Church has falsified the text, and also expunged from her *Protestant Canon*, many *inspired* Books of the Scripture. Really, can you obtain the possession of property by *corrupt* and mutilated title-deeds? Certainly not. How, *then*, are your people to obtain eternal life by your *false*, and

mutilated title-deeds of the Scripture? Really, most Reverend Gentlemen, if the prejudices of my popish education do not strongly deceive me, your Protestant mutilation of the Scripture, and your Sixth Article, are pregnant with the most *paradoxical* consequences. O how justly may I apply to *your* Scriptural Church, the observations which a distinguished minister of the Church of *England*, applied to the operations of the Bible Society; these are his words: "Surely, it is enough to make a Christian's blood run cold, to think of the sacrilegious presumption of a Society, which dares thus to tamper, and trifle with the revelation of the Almighty, and dares publish to the heathen, and attempt to pawn upon its credulous supporters, these school-boy exercises of its agents, as the Sacred Word of God! It is the circulation of such translations as these, that, more than once, at the meetings of this Society, have been blasphemously compared to the miraculous gift of tongues. And such a system is supported, and such comparisons applauded by many, who, on other occasions, lay claim, and justly, to the characters of piety and intelligence."* O how justly might he have applied these observations to his own Church.†

* Appendix to, "Reasons why I am not a member of the Bible Society. By the Hon. Arthur Philip Percival, B.C.L. Chaplain in Ordinary to His Majesty."—Fifth Edition.

† Would my Lord Harewood, who *lately* figured so conspicuously on the platform in York, as the advocate for the pure and unadulterated Word of God, without note or comment, point out to the people *the sure guide*, which they are to follow, amidst this *awful Protestant* falsification, and mutilation of the Sacred Scriptures? The Spanish chemist (as related above) cut his master into pieces, and put the pieces into his sublimatory glass, with the hope of raising his master, to a more perfect state than he enjoyed, when God made him. Now, my Lord, from what I have said above, has not the Protestant Church, cut the Scriptures into pieces, and put them into the sublimatory glass of falsification and mutilation? but, my Lord, will she be ever able to raise them again, to as perfect a state as they were in, when God made them, or when your Protestant Church received them, from the hands of the Catholic Church? I am sure, my Lord, she will be here at *fault*. Another remark or two, my Lord, and I have done. The man, who embraces a religious opinion from conviction, has undoubtedly the right to maintain it by argument. But truth will be his first and principal object, and the champion of truth, will disdain the petty artifices of substituting assertion for truth, and misrepresentation for fact. He will never condescend to swell the

We have now seen, most Reverend Gentlemen, the falsification, and mutilation of the Sacred Scriptures, by the Protestant Reformers. Your Sixth Article tells the people, that the Scriptures are the only means of salvation; but of course, she must mean *correct* copies, and *authenticated* translations of those sacred volumes. Now, what are the people to do for eternal life,

crowd of idle disputants, whose ingenuity first, frames a creed for the Church of Rome, and then, after combatting a phantom of its own creation, exults in an easy and a decisive victory. My Lord, just adopt this advice in all your *future* observations on the creed of Catholics, and then, you will escape two ridiculous consequences; of exalting the Scriptures on the one hand, and of transgressing on the other, one of the golden precepts of that sacred volume, "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour." But far be it from me, my Lord, to *assert* that you have *already done* this. I merely wish to guard your Lordship, against the above ridiculous consequences. Now, as your ideas, with regard to the *Catholic* doctrine on the Scriptures, appear to be rather vague, I will just state, in short, our doctrine on that subject. Our Saviour commanded his apostles to go and preach his gospel, and after they had done this for a certain time, he then inspired some of them to write certain books, for the fuller instruction of those persons on certain points, which they either did not perfectly understand, or of which they were ignorant. For, as the apostles were absent from these persons, (for twelve men could not be in many places at the same time,) they found it necessary to communicate by their pens, certain instructions which these persons required. Now, as what the apostles *wrote*, as well as what they *preached*, was *equally* the inspired Word of God, the Catholic Church, afterwards, carefully collected those sacred books, which were written by some of these inspired men, gave to the whole of these sacred books thus collected, the name of the New Testament, and presented this volume to the people as the inspired Word of God, and has handed it down as such to her faithful in every age, in as perfect a manner as possible. And in the distribution of it to her faithful in every age, she has followed the example of the apostles. For she orders her ministers to go *first*, to preach and teach the gospel to the people, and *afterwards*, for their further instruction, she puts the sacred Scriptures into the hands of the faithful. But mind, as your Protestant Reformers have *shamefully* corrupted and mutilated the sacred Scriptures, she rejects your human and metamorphosed translations, forbids the use of your incorrect, corrupt, and mutilated translations, and puts into their hands, *well-authenticated* copies of that sacred volume. Hence, on account of her *great anxiety*, for the distribution of *correct*, and *well-authenticated* copies among her faithful, certain Protestants have the *audacity* to assert, that the Catholic Church, forbids the use of the Scripture to her people, or at least, will not let them read the pure word of God without note or comment. Do I impeach the veracity of these Protestants? Of some indeed I do, but not of all. But this I will say, most of them might know better, if they would only seek information

placed as they are, on the one hand, between your falsified, corrupt, and mutilated Scriptures, and on the other hand, the absolute necessity (according to your Sixth Article) of culling their religion from the Scriptures? But, as there is no hope of salvation, for the people in this awful fix, do you think, you could raise a church for the people, instead of these falsified scriptures? But then, it is evident, that you cannot raise that church, on the frail foundation of these falsified, and mutilated scriptures. Really I am sorry, that I declined the assistance of the Spanish chemist, as he might, perhaps, have thrown some new light, on this subject by his wonderful chemical operations. O! but a very bright idea, has just popped into my mind, that your Protestant prayer-book, was first made 'by the aid of the Holy Ghost, and for the honour of God.' Surely, we shall now succeed, by the aid of the Holy Ghost, and for the noble object of God's honour. Well, then, we will now see, how this prayer-book, was first made by men, 'aided by the Holy Ghost, and for the honour of God;' we will then see, how these very men who at first declare, that this prayer-book, which was made by the aid of the Holy Ghost, and for the honour of God, afterwards most solemnly swear, that all these inspirations of the Holy Ghost were heretical, and contrary to true religion, and then, how they

from proper sources. I hope, this short explanation of the *Catholic* doctrine on the Scripture, will satisfy Lord Harewood, and caution him never to speak on matters, which *essentially* concern *his neighbour's* interest, *unless* he *first* perfectly understands them.

One word more, and I have done. I once heard, that a Noble Lord, attending a great County Meeting, in the York Castle-yard, had achieved for himself a lasting notoriety, by declaring, that in his opinion, "the Bible ought to be read by all men, and women, and children, and *even* idiots. And scarcely had the merriment excited by this memorable burst of sound sense subsided, before his Lordship was heard thus resuming his exhilarating eloquence. "Yes, even by idiots. I myself have derived great advantage from that book." The effect upon the meeting was electric. The noble advocate of the unfortunate idiots, had so completely identified himself with his clients, that laughter became irresistible, and to what class of intelligent beings, his Lordship belonged, most evident. I believe this is the only instance on record, of a Noble Earl, establishing his religious opinions, at the expense of his understanding.

bring back this prayer-book, and enact the most severe penalties on all, who will not adopt its use.

In the reign of Henry the Eighth, the faith of Protestantism, and defection from the Catholic faith, first partially began. In the reign of his son, Edward VI., Protestantism, made a-head, and Catholicism, rapidly declined. It was in the reign of this youth Edward VI., (only eleven years of age,) that the Protestant prayer-book, was made by Act of Parliament. In the preamble of this Act (i. & ii. Edward VI.) we are informed that Edward (only eleven years of age) appointed the Archbishop of Canterbury, and others, who, "aided by the Holy Ghost, and for the honour of God," made this prayer-book. Take notice that this Act (i. & ii. Edward VI.) declares, that this Protestant prayer-book, was made by these men, "aided by the Holy Ghost, and for the honour of God." This Act of Parliament, provided also, that if any clergyman, refused to use this prayer-book, in the public service, he should, for the first offence, forfeit to the King one year's income of his benefice, and be imprisoned for six months; for the second, he should be deprived of the whole of his benefice, and be imprisoned for one year; and for the third offence, he should be imprisoned for his whole life. But this Act, was not confined merely to the clergy, it extended also to the laity. It enacted, that if any layman, should by interludes, plays, songs, rhymes, or by other open words, declare, or speak anything to the derogation of the said common prayer-book, penalty after penalty, was to follow, until he had forfeited all his goods, and chattels to the King, and to be imprisoned for life. Such, was the first formation, of your Protestant prayer-book, as the Act of Parliament, (i. & ii. Edward VI.) plainly shews.

Now, let us see the result, in the next reign. Edward died seven years afterwards, and was succeeded by his sister, Mary, who was a Catholic. Almost, as soon as Mary had ascended the throne, the very men repeal the whole of the famous Act, for making the common prayer-book, and that too, on the grounds that this prayer-book, was contrary to true religion, although, in the former reign, they had solemnly declared, they

had been assisted, "by the Holy Ghost" in the making of this prayer-book; they also abolished all the pains, and penalties, which they had enacted, in the former reign, against the clergy, and laity, for not using this common prayer-book, and this too, on the express ground, that they had been for years, wandering in error, and schism, although, they had had the barefacedness to assert, in the previous reign, that the Holy Ghost, had assisted them in the formation of this common prayer-book.

Well, Mary died about five years afterwards, and was succeeded by her sister Elizabeth, who was at first a Catholic, but shortly turned Protestant. Now the second Act of this Queen, (i. Eliz. chap. 2.) brought back again, this prayer-book. In Mary's reign these very men, had abolished this very prayer-book, as schismatical, they now recall this common prayer-book, and inflict the most severe penalties, upon all, who will not use it, in the public service. For the first offence, it was now enacted, the clergy were to forfeit a year's income, and be imprisoned for a year; for the second offence, they were to forfeit all their incomes, and be imprisoned for life, for refusing to use this common prayer-book, in the public service. The people also, were compelled on Sundays, and holydays, to attend the Church, and to use this common prayer-book, under various penalties, and in failure of paying these penalties, they were to be imprisoned. Bishops, Archdeacons, and other Ordinaries, were to have power, to inflict these punishments. Really the conduct of these men, is, so inconsistent and monstrous, that if we had not Acts of Parliament for it, I should have been afraid to state it, upon any other authority. In the reign of Edward, these very men make the common prayer-book, and declare it a work of the Holy Ghost, and for the honour of God; then, in about seven years afterwards, in the reign of Mary, they declare this book to be schismatical, and contrary to true religion, although in the former reign, they had asserted, it was a work of the Holy Ghost, and for the honour of God; and then in about five years afterwards, these very men recant again, recall this prayer-book, and inflict the most severe pains, and penalties, both on clergy and laity, who refuse the use of it. Most

Reverend Gentlemen, may I ask you, what kind of a prayer-book, must that be, which was made by these inconsistent, and monstrous men? and yet, such is your Protestant prayer-book, of the Church of England as by Law established.

But some of you reverends, will perhaps reply, really, Sir, it is too bad of you, thus to lower our Protestant Prayer-book, for we Protestants all know, how many beautiful, and admirable parts there are in that Church Prayer-book. Most Reverend Gentlemen, before I answer this objection, we must quietly trace back our steps to the Spanish chemist. Of course, I have forbidden myself the application of his wonderful, chemical operations to your Church. But then, you yourselves can apply them, and judge whether there really is, any analogy or not, between his chemical operations, and the spiritual works of your scriptural Church. Well, then, I have shewn you, what a beautiful Church God and Jesus Christ first built; and I have shown you the sure, and infallible foundation of that Church, which was to be perpetuated from age to age, with the world for its boundaries, and time for its duration. I have shewn you, how, in the sixteenth century, arose a body of men, the most audacious, and strange spiritual chemists, that the world ever beheld, whether you consider the spiritual instructor of some of them, or whether you consider the strange doctrines they advanced, and the barefaced manner, in which they defended, and propagated their new-fangled ideas. I have shewn you, how these strange spiritual chemists, wished to demolish God's infallible Church, how they cut it into pieces of universal and damnable idolatry, how then, they put these various parts into the sublimentary glass of falsification, and mutilation of God's word. You then saw, how these spiritual chemists, and their followers, have been trying in vain, for these three hundred years at least, to collect, and unite, and form these various parts of Christ's Church (which according to their bare assertion, had fallen into error), into a more perfect, and durable form, than that which God had first given it. You have seen, how these Protestant children of the Reformation, honoured England with a Protestant Prayer-book, the formation of which, almost defies all the power of credibility;

and were there not Acts of Parliament to show this, it would be an insult to any Englishman, to assert such a thing in his presence. Now with all these facts before you, is there not a great analogy, between the outrageous conduct of your Church, and that of the Spanish chemist, who destroyed his master, with the design of raising him, to a more perfect and durable state, than that which God had first given him?

I ask you, most Reverend Gentlemen, with all these awful and incontestible facts before you, will your Protestant Church, ever be able to raise Christ's Church, to as perfect and as durable a state, as she *is now*, and *was then*, when you withdrew from her? Your Protestant Church has been trying her hand, at this work of reformation, for more than three hundred years, and still she is something like the Irishman's wife: Pat got married, and in about three months after, went to the priest, and said, "Plaise your reverince, you didn't marry me and my wife rightly." "Well," asked the clergyman, "how did I marry you wrongly?" "Plaise your reverince, didn't you say, I was to take my wife for better, and for worse?" "Certainly," replied the priest. "Now, plaise your reverince, she's all worse, and no better." Really, how justly may we apply this to your Church of England as by law established. In short, this country, the wonder of the world in commerce, in the arts and sciences, in the extent of her navy, and the power of her army, this wonderful nation, presents, in point of religion, a confused medley of every sort, and of every form of worship, a perfect chaos of doctrines, in which every one plunges, and tosses, dogmatizing as fancy or feeling directs. In consequence of this confusion of religious opinions, men know not, to whom to listen, what to believe, or what to do. This confusion of religious opinions, and doctrines, commenced with the Reformation, and has continued, and daily increased ever since. O how justly did a chief of the savages, address, near Boston, a missionary, who had gone with his Bible, to convert the pagans of that country. "How," asked this chief, "can *your* religion be the *true* one, since you *white* men do not all profess the *same*? Agree among *yourselves* in this point, and *then* we will attend to you." (Phil. Gaz Nov. 1817.)

But some of you reverends, will ask again : Really, sir, do you pretend to assert, that our Common Prayer-book, and that our Protestant Church, do not contain *any* spiritual treasures ? I answer, that in all counterfeit coin, which is well executed, the gold is often laid on the base metal rather thickly, and with great ingenuity. Now, this is the case with your counterfeit prayer-book, and with your counterfeit religion. Whoever will take the pains to examine carefully, the strange mixture of good, and of evil, which is to be found in your Protestant Prayer-book, and in your Protestant religion, will, at first, stand astonished, but his astonishment will soon cease, when he finds that the little good which is in them, flows from the Church of Jesus Christ, which you formerly left, and that the evils with which they abound, flow from the inventions and the ingenuity of man.

Allow me to give you a few instances of this. In the Apostles' creed (and in your Thirty-nine Articles you admit this creed as the word of God), you profess to believe, in the Holy Catholic Church. Now, this is the real word of God, which your Church admits ; but then, you also solemnly declare, that you believe in your hearts, and from your soul, that the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church is idolatrous. Now this is the mere human invention of your Protestant Church. Now when these two doctrines, the one from God, and the other from man, are brought in contact, let us see what sad consequences they make with you, and your scriptural Church. You profess to believe, in the Catholic Church ; but Catholic, means universal, and as the Roman Catholics form the greatest body of Christians, their Church only, can be the Catholic, or universal Church ; for Catholic, and universal, mean the *same* thing. But mind, you destroy this Catholic or universal Church. How ? Why you swear, that her doctrine is idolatrous. How, then, can she be holy ? Thus, you see, by joining in religion the word of God, with the inventions of man, you destroy (though perhaps without intending it) the holy Catholic Church, in which you profess to believe.

I will now give you another instance. At the end of the Communion Service of your Common Prayer-book, I find these

words: "It is hereby declared, that thereby no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread or wine, there bodily received, or to any corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood. For the sacramental bread and wine, remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore, may not be adored, for that were idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians." Of course, the plain meaning of these words is, that Jesus Christ is not present in the Lord's Supper, and therefore, it would be a great crime to there adore him. But, what does your Church Catechism (which is in your prayer-book) teach children on this subject? Why, it asks them, "What is the inward part, or the thing signified?" Your Church Catechism answers: "The Body and Blood of Christ, which are *verily* and *indeed* taken, and *received* by the faithful, in the *Lord's Supper*." Now this declares, that our Saviour, is *really* present in the *Lord's Supper*, for how can you *really*, and indeed *take* Him, and *receive* Him, if He is not *really* there? Thus, in *one* part of your prayer-book, you solemnly declare, that our Saviour is *not* present, in the *Lord's Supper*, and therefore it would be idolatry there to adore him; but in *another* part of the *same* prayer-book, you teach children that He is *present*; and that they *verily* and *indeed* take Him and *receive* Him in the *Lord's Supper*. The Act of Parliament of Edward VI., for the making of this Common Prayer-book, declares it to be a work of the Holy Ghost; but I hope you will excuse me for saying, that I think it was a very curious Holy Ghost, and whether it was black, or white, really I have not sufficient of the prophet in me to divine. But how was this *manifest* contradiction, introduced into your prayer-book? Why, I will tell you; the doctrine of the *real* presence of our Saviour in the Blessed Sacrament, had been believed by the great body of Christians, ever since the time of our Saviour, until the Reformation. Luther and Zuinglius, indeed, as you know, were convinced *by the devil*, that our Saviour was *not* present in the Blessed Sacrament, and that, therefore, it would be idolatry to believe it; but then, how were they to manage to substitute their new-fangled opinions, for the constant belief of all former christian ages? Why, they made

flesh and fish of them; they mixed together again the word of God with the inventions of man, and then, thought that the people's orthodox stomachs, would *swallow better* their new-fangled religious ideas.

But, what has often amused me the most, in your scriptural Church, is this; you solemnly declare, that the doctrine of Catholics, is idolatrous; but, should any of these poor Catholic sinners, condescend to lay their idolatrous bones, in any of your churchyards; what do you *then* declare? Why, that you commit to the dust, this Catholic, (who according to you during life has been a most idolatrous sinner,) "in the sure, and certain hope of resurrection to eternal life, through our Lord Jesus Christ;" for you would thus pray: "O merciful God, we meekly beseech Thee, that when we shall depart this life, we may rest in Him (Christ) as our hope is, this our brother doth." Thus you tell us, that during life, we Catholics live in the horrible sin of idolatry, and then, after death, you are willing to commit us, *for a comfortable fee*, "to the dust, in the sure, and certain hope of the resurrection to eternal life, through our Lord Jesus Christ."

Again, you often warn the people, against the idolatrous practice of praying to the Saints, and assure the people, there is *only one* mediator, our Lord Jesus Christ. And yet, on Sundays, you have no difficulty, in recommending the sick, to the prayers of the faithful. But, why should *you* do *this*, when according to *you*, there is *only one* mediator, our Lord Jesus Christ? If *you* can thus ask the prayers of the faithful, without injuring the mediation of our Saviour; why cannot the *Catholic*, ask the prayers of the Saints, without injuring the mediation of Jesus Christ? O! but you will say, the Saints, and Angels cannot hear our prayers. Well but does not the Scripture tell us, "that the devil goes about, like a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour," and does not our Saviour say, "there is more joy in heaven, over one sinner doing penance, than over ninety-nine just?" It appears, therefore, the devils know, and hear what is passing upon earth, and why should not the saints and angels of God? Nay, it is evident, they *must* know and hear

things, which are passing upon earth, otherwise how could they rejoice *in heaven*, on the conversion of sinners *on earth*?

But, as you boast so much of the admirable, spiritual treasures of your prayer-book, and of your scriptural Church, just tell me, most Reverend Gentlemen, why they have never yet, been able to produce a single saint? The Scripture, tells us, that a tree, may be known from *its fruit*. And yet, among all the rich spiritual treasures, of your prayer-book, and of your scriptural Church, for these three hundred years, you have *never* yet produced a person, who, on account of his virtue and piety, has been honoured by posterity with the name of *saint*. Nay, so great is your poverty in *this respect*, that your Church, has been obliged to *steal Catholic Saints*, and barefacedly insert *them*, in your *Protestant* calendar. Really most Reverend Gentlemen, your scriptural Church, is of a very strange texture. I have shewn you above, how remarkable she has always been for forgery; I have also shewn you, how she unjustly robbed the poor of their just rights, and how, she has endeavoured, by all means possible, to rob us of the honourable name of Catholic; and how, she has stolen many of our great Catholic Saints, and presumptuously inserted *them* in her *Protestant* calendar. Really, Gentlemen, may I not exclaim with the poet—

“ Can such things be,
And overcome us like a summer’s cloud,
Without our special wonder ?”

But, Sir, if the Protestant prayer-book, and the Protestant religion, be such a monstrous compound of inconsistencies and errors, as you would fain lead us to suppose, pray tell us, why England, was so foolish, as to renounce the Catholic, and embrace the Protestant faith? The answer to this objection I would most willingly waive, as it would lead me into a field of persecution, and *cruelty*, over which my feelings would not wish to travel. But as the answer to the above objection, has been so ably given, by a *Protestant* member of Parliament, to a *Protestant* Lord, I think I cannot do *better*, than give it in his own words. And *mind*, when you read this letter, you must not imagine, that

you are reading the *mere* opinions of *this* writer ; no, the opinions which he there states, are *incontestible facts*, which stand, almost as large as life, in our English Statute-Book ; and are there, recorded so plainly, that no man in his senses, can have the presumption to deny them. I beg leave, therefore, to lay before you, the following letter, of a *Protestant* member of Parliament, to a *Protestant* lord, on the present subject ; and I am sure, that the *incontestible facts*, *facts of our own English Statute-book*, there stated, will convince you, how England once Catholic, was brought over to Protestantism.

A LETTER TO LORD TENTERDEN,

LORD CHIEF JUSTICE OF ENGLAND.

“ MY LORD,

April 6th, 1829.

“ I have read the report of your Lordship’s speech, made on the 4th instant, on the second reading of the Catholic Bill, and there is one passage of it on which I think it my duty thus publicly to remark. The passage to which I allude relates to the character of the *Law-established Church*, and also to the probable fate that will, in consequence of this bill, attend her in Ireland.*

“ Now, with very sincere respect for your Lordship, I do think it my duty to the people of this country, to show that the character which you have given to the Church of England as by *law* established, is not correct ; to show that she is not, and never has been, *tolerant in matters of religion* ; and is not, and never has been, *favourable to civil liberty*. In short, with most sincere respect for your Lordship, with greater respect for you than I have ever had for any public functionary in England, and with the greatest admiration of your conduct in your high and important office, with all these, I think it my duty *flatly to contradict* your Lordship with regard to the character of this Church, and especially in the two particulars mentioned by you. I do not charge you with insincerity : for why should you not be in error as to this matter, when I know that *twenty or thirty years ago* I myself should, in a similar case, have said just what you have now said on this subject ? Nevertheless, it being error, and gross error too, and I *knowing it to be error*, I am bound, in duty to my readers, to expose the error ; and I am the more strictly bound, because this error coming from you, is the more likely to be widely spread.

“ First, then, my Lord, let us take your proposition, ‘that there is no Church so tolerant as this.’ I am sure your Lordship has never read her history ; I am sure you have not ; if you had, you never would have uttered these words. Not being content to deal in general terms, I will *not* say that she has been, and was from her outset, the most intolerant Church that the

* Here follows a long extract from Lord Tenterden’s Speech, which it is unnecessary to reprint.

world ever saw; that she started at first, armed with halters, ripping-knives, axes, and racks; that her footsteps were marked with the blood, while her back bent under the plunder of her innumerable innocent victims; and that for refinement in cruelty, and extent of rapacity, she never had an equal, whether corporate or sole. I will not thus speak of her in general terms, but will lay before your Lordship some historical *facts*, to make good that *contradiction* which I have given to your words. I assert that this LAW-CHURCH is the most INTOLERANT Church I ever read or heard of; and this assertion I now proceed to make good.

“This Church began to *exist* in 1547, and in the reign of Edward VI. Until now the religion of the country had been for several years under the tyrant Henry VIII. a sort of mongrel; but now it became wholly Protestant by LAW. The Articles of Religion and the Common Prayer-book were now drawn up, and were established by Acts of Parliament. The Catholic altars were pulled down in all the Churches; the priests, on pain of ouster and fine, were compelled to teach the new religion, that is to say, to be apostates; and the people who had been born and bred Catholics were not only punished if they heard mass, but were also punished if they did not go to hear the new parsons; that is to say, if they refused to become apostates. The people, smarting under this tyranny, rose in insurrection in several parts, and, indeed, all over the country. They complained that they had been robbed of their religion, and of the relief to the poor which the old Church gave; and they demanded that the mass and the monasteries should be restored, and that the priests should not be allowed to marry. And how were they answered? The bullet and bayonet at the hand of German troops slaughtered a part, caused another part to be hanged, another part to be imprisoned and flogged, and the remainder to submit, outwardly at least, to the LAW-CHURCH; (and now mark this tolerant and merciful Church,) many of the old monastics and priests, who had been expelled from their convents and livings, were compelled to beg their bread about the country, and they thus found subsistence among the pious Catholics. This was an eye-sore to the LAW-CHURCH, who deemed the very existence of these men who had refused to apostatize, a libel on her. Therefore, in company, actually in company with the law that founded the new Church, came forth a law to punish beggars, by burning them in the face with a red-hot iron, and by making them slaves for two years, with power in their masters to make them wear an iron collar. Your Lordship must have read this Act of Parliament, passed in the first year of the first Protestant reign, and coming forth in company with the Common Prayer-book. This was tolerant work, to be sure; and fine proof we have here of this Church being “favourable to civil and religious liberty.” Not content with stripping these faithful Catholic priests of their livings; not content with turning them out upon the wide world, this tolerant Church must cause them to perish with hunger, or to be branded slaves.

“Such was the tolerant spirit of this Church when she was young. As to her burnings under Cranmer (who made the Prayer-book), they are hardly worthy of particular notice, when we have before us the sweeping cruelties of this first Protestant reign, during which, short as it was, the people of England suffered so much that the suffering actually thinned their numbers; it was a people partly destroyed, and that too in the space of about six years;

and this is acknowledged even in Acts of Parliament of that day. But this LAW-CHURCH was established in reality during the reign of Old Bess, which lasted forty-five years; that is, from 1558 to 1603; and though this Church has always kept up its character, even to the present day, its deeds during this long reign are the most remarkable.

“Bess (the shorter the name the better), established what she called a *court of high commission*, consisting chiefly of *bishops* of your Lordship’s ‘*most tolerant Church*,’ in order to punish all who did not conform to her religious creed, she being ‘*the head of the Church*.’ This commission were empowered to have control over the *opinions* of all men, and to punish all men according to their *discretion*, *short of death*. They had power to extort evidence by the *prison* or by the *rack*. They had power to compel a man (*on oath*) to *reveal his thoughts*, and to *accuse himself, his friend, brother, parent, wife, or child*; and this, too, on *pain of death*. These monsters, in order to *discover priests*, and to crush the old religion, *fined, imprisoned, racked*, and did such things as would have made Nero shudder to think of. They sent hundreds to the *rack* in order to get from them confessions, *on which confessions many of them were put to death*.

“I have not room to make even an enumeration of the deeds of religious persecution of this long and bloody reign; but I will state a few of them.

“1. It was *death* to make a new Catholic priest within the kingdom.—2. It was *death* for a Catholic priest to come into the kingdom from abroad.—3. It was *death* to harbour a Catholic priest coming from abroad.—4. It was *death* to confess to such a priest.—5. It was *death* for any priest to say mass. 6. It was *death* for any one to hear mass. 7. It was *death* to *deny* or *not to swear*, if called on, that this woman was the head of the Church of Christ.—8. It was an offence (punishable by heavy fine) *not to go to the Protestant Church*. This fine was £20 a lunar month, or £250 a-year, and of our present money, £3,250 a year. Thousands upon thousands refused to go to the Law-Church; and thus the head of the Church sacked thousands upon thousands of estates! The poor conscientious Catholics who refused to go to the ‘*most tolerant*’ Church, and who had no money to pay fines, were crammed into the gaols, until the counties petitioned to be relieved from the expense of keeping them. They were then discharged, being first publicly whipped, and having their ears bored with a red-hot iron. But this very great ‘*toleration*’ not answering the purpose, an act was passed to banish for life all these non-goers to Church, if they were not worth twenty pounds; and, in case of return, they were to be punished with death.

“I am, my Lord, not making loose assertions here; I am all along stating from Acts of Parliament, and the above form a small sample of the whole; and this your Lordship must know well. I am not declaiming, but relating undeniable facts; and with facts of the same character, with a *bare list*, made in the above manner, I could fill a considerable volume. The names of the persons put to death merely for *being Catholics*, during this long and bloody reign, would, especially if it were to include Ireland, form a list ten times as long as that of *our army and navy*, both taken together. The usual mode of inflicting death was to hang the victim for a short time, just to benumb his or her faculties; then cut down and instantly rip open the belly, and *tear out the heart*, and hold it up, fling the bowels into a fire, then chop off the head, and cut the

body into quarters, then *boil* the head and quarters, and then hang them up at the gates of cities, or other conspicuous places. This was done, including Ireland, to many hundreds of persons, merely for adhering to the Church in which they had been born and bred. There were ONE HUNDRED and EIGHTY-SEVEN *ripped up and boiled* in England in the years from 1577 to 1603; that is to say, in the last twenty-six years of Bess's reign; and these might all have been spared if they would have agreed to go to Church and *hear* the Common Prayer! All, or nearly all, of them were racked before they were put to death; and the cruelties in prison, and the manner of execution, were the most horrible that can be conceived. They were flung into dungeons, and kept in their filth, and fed on bullock's liver, boiled but unwashed tripe, and such things as dogs are fed upon. Edward Genings, a priest, detected in saying *mass* in Holborn, was after sentence of death offered his pardon if he would go to Church, but having refused to do this, and having at the place of execution boldly said, that he would die a thousand deaths rather than acknowledge the Queen to be the spiritual *head* of the Church, Topcliffe, the attorney-general, ordered the rope to be cut the moment the victim was turned off, 'so that' (says the historian) 'the priest, being little or nothing stunned, stood on his feet, casting his eyes towards heaven, till the hangman tripped up his heels, and flung him on the block, where he was ripped up and quartered.' He was so much alive, even after the bowelling, that he cried with a loud voice, 'Oh! it smarts!' And then he exclaimed, '*Sancte Gregorie, ora pro me*:' while the hangman having sworn a most wicked oath, cried, 'Zounds! his heart is in my hand, and yet Gregory is in his mouth!'

"The tolerance of the Law-Church was shown towards women as well as towards men. There was a Mrs. Ward, who, for assisting a priest to escape from prison (the crime of that priest being saying mass), was imprisoned, flogged, racked, and finally hanged, ripped up, and quartered. She was executed at Tyburn, on the 30th of August, 1588. At her trial the judges asked if she had done the thing laid to her charge. She said 'Yes!' and that she was happy to reflect that she had been the means of 'delivering that innocent lamb from the hands of those bloody wolves.' They in vain endeavoured to terrify her into a confession relative to the place whither the priest was gone; and when they found threats unavailing, they promised her pardon if she would go to Church; but she answered, that she would lose many lives if she had them, rather than acknowledge the heretical Church. They, therefore, treated her very savagely, ripped her up while in her senses, and made a mockery of her naked quarters.

"There was a Mrs. Clithero pressed to death at York, in the year 1586. She was a lady of good family, and her crime was relieving and harbouring priests. She refused to plead, that she might not tell a lie, nor expose others to danger. She was, therefore, pressed to death, in the following manner. She was laid on the floor, on her back. Her hands and feet were bound down as close as possible. Then a great door was laid upon her, and many hundred weights placed upon that door. Sharp stones were put under her back, and the weights pressing upon her body, first broke her ribs, and finally, though by no means quickly, extinguished life. Before she was laid on the floor, Fawcett, the sheriff, commanded her to be stripped naked,

when she, with four women who accompanied her, requested him, on their knees, for the honour of womanhood, that this might be dispensed with; but he refused. Her husband was forced to flee the country; her little children who wept for their dear and good mother, were taken up, and being questioned concerning their religious belief, and answering as they had been taught by her, were severely whipped, and the eldest, who was but twelve years old, was cast into prison.

“Need I go on, my Lord? Twenty large volumes, allotting only one page to each case, would not, if we were to include Ireland, contain an account of those who have fallen victims to their refusal to conform to this ‘most tolerant Church in the world.’ Nay, a hundred volumes, each volume being 500 pages, and one page allowed to each victim, would not suffice for the holding of this bloody record. Short of death by ripping up, there were, *death* by martial law, *death* in prison, and this in cases without number, banishment and loss of estate. Doctor Bridgewater, in a table published by him at the end of the *Concertatio Ecclesiæ Catholicæ*, gives the names of about twelve hundred who had suffered in this way, before the year 1588; that is to say, before the great heat of the ‘tolerance.’ In this list there are 21 bishops, 120 monastics, 13 deans, 14 archdeacons, 60 prebendaries, 530 priests, 49 doctors of divinity, 18 doctors of law, 15 masters of colleges, 8 earls, 10 barons, 26 knights, 326 gentlemen, 60 ladies and gentlewomen. Many of all those, and, indeed, the greater part of them, died in prison, and several of them died while under sentence of death.

“There, my Lord, I do not think that you will question the truth of this statement: and if you cannot, I hope you will allow, that no lover of truth and justice ought to be silent while reports of speeches are circulating, calling this ‘the most tolerant Church in the world.’ But, my Lord, why need I, in addressing myself to you on this subject, do more than refer you to the cruel, the savage, the bloody penal code? Leaving poor half-murdered Ireland out of the question, what have I to do, in answer to your praises of this Church, and your assertion as to its tolerance, but to request you to remember the enactments in the following Acts of Old Bess, the head and the establisher of this Church? Stat. i. chap. 1 and 2; Stat. v. chap. 1; Stat. xii. chap. 2; Stat. xxiii. chap. 1; Stat. xxvii. chap. 2; Stat. xxix. chap. 6; Stat. xxxv. chap. 1; Stat. xxxv. chap. 2? What have I to do, my Lord, but to request you to look at, or rather to call to mind those laws of plunder and of blood; *fine, fine, fine; banish, banish, banish; or death, death, death* in every line? Your Lordship knows that this is true: you know that all these horrors, all this hellish tyranny, that the whole arose out of a desire to make this Protestant Church predominant. How, then, can this Protestant Church be called ‘the most tolerant in the world?’ I have here given a mere sample of the doings of this Law-Church. I have not taken your Lordship to Ireland, half-murdered Ireland; nor have I even hinted at many acts done in England during Bess’s reign, each of which would have excited the indignation of every virtuous man on earth; but I must not omit to mention two traits of tolerance in this Church: **FIRST**, Edward VI. was advised to *bring his sister Mary to trial*, and, of course to punishment, for not conforming to the Law-Church; and she was saved only by the menaces of her cousin, the Emperor Charles V. **SECOND**,

when Mary, Queen of Scotland, had been condemned to die, she, though she earnestly sued for it, WAS NOT ALLOWED TO HAVE A PRIEST TO PERFORM THE RELIGIOUS OFFICES DEEMED SO NECESSARY IN SUCH CASES. They brought the Protestant Dean of Peterborough to pray by or with her; but she would not hear him. When her head fell from the block the Dean exclaimed. 'So let our Queen's enemies perish!' And the Earl of Kent responded 'Amen.' Baker in his Chronicle, p. 273, says, that the death of this Queen was earnestly desired, because 'that if she lived, the religion received in England could not subsist.'

"This Church has been no *changeling*; she has been of the same character from the day of her establishment to the present hour; in Ireland her deeds have surpassed those of Mahomet; but it would take a large volume to put down a bare list of her intolerant deeds. She at last, however, seems to be nearly at the end of her tether; the nation has always been making sacrifices to her haughty predominance. Boulogne and Calais were the first sacrifices; *poor-rates*, and an *enormous debt*, and a *standing army*, and a *civil list* have followed; all, yea all, to be ascribed to the predominance of this Church, and her haughty spirit of ascendancy. But now the nation has made so many and such great sacrifices to her, that *it can make no more*. It cannot venture on *another civil war* (about the *twentieth*), in order to support the ascendancy of this Church; and be you assured, my Lord, that that hierarchy in Ireland, to uphold which you seem so very anxious, is not much longer to be upheld by any power on earth, seeing that all the miseries of Ireland, all of them, without a single exception, are to be traced directly to that hierarchy: and in these miseries *England sees terrific danger*.

"The case is very plain. The opponents of the Catholic Bill say, We dislike it, because it exposes the Church, and especially the *Irish Church*, to imminent *danger*. The answer of the Duke is, I cannot prevent this danger without *risking a civil war*; and the State *cannot afford that*. The Law-Church might reply, Why there have been many, many civil wars carried on for the purpose of upholding my ascendancy; but to that the Duke might rejoin, Very true; but we have now a paper-money-system (also made to uphold you) *which cannot live in civil war*, and the death of which may produce that of the State itself; and, therefore, you must be now left to support your ascendancy by your talents, piety, zeal, charity, humility, and sound doctrine. This is the true state of the case, my Lord, and, therefore, unless the Church can support itself by these means, it is manifestly destined to fall.

"I am your Lordship's most humble and most obedient Servant,

"WM. COBBETT."

Most Reverend Gentlemen, after reading the above letter, (and mind, the writer informs you, that what he there asserts, is proved by acts of parliament,) after reading the above letter, can it for a moment be thought strange, that England should have left the Catholic, and embraced the Protestant faith? Nay, is it not more strange, with all the above *incontestible* facts before us,

is it not, I repeat, more strange, that there should have been left, a single Catholic, or a single fibre of Catholicity, in this country? And had it not been for the providence of God, this would certainly have been the case; but the Scripture beautifully informs us, "that to them, who love God, all things work together unto good." (*Rom. viii., 28.*)

But, Most Reverend Gentlemen, I have ranged over so much spiritual ground, and have been so busily occupied in bagging black game, that I have nearly forgotten the famous text, "extraordinary and presumptuous movement," which your meeting were so kind as to give me to preach from. Really, I must not forget *my text*, otherwise you will begin to conclude, I must be a very *bungling* preacher. Let us, then, now return to my famous text. I think, that you must have been already convinced, from what I have stated, in the first part of this address to you Clergy, that your scriptural Church, has been for a long time, making a most "extraordinary and presumptuous movement," on the *pockets* of Englishmen. By *now* recapitulating what I have just said in the latter part of this address, I think it will be also plain, that your Church has been making, for a long time, a most "extraordinary and presumptuous movement" on the *intellects* of Englishmen.

I have shown you, as above, what a beautiful Church Christ built, which, erected on an infallible and imperishable foundation, was to be the Church of all ages, with the world for its boundaries, and time for its duration. I have shown you, how your first Reformers, and your Protestant scriptural Church, had the barefacedness to assert, that this Church of Christ once fell into error, although *God* had pledged his solemn word, that this Church *never should err*; I have also shown you, how this assertion of Christ's Church falling into error, was the *mere ipse dixit* of the *first* Reformers, and of your scriptural Church; and that they had both unfortunately forgotten to prove, *when, where, and how*, this *infallible* Church of Christ had fallen *into error*. Now, I appeal to you, if this was not, a most "extraordinary and presumptuous movement," of your scriptural Church, on the *intellects* of Englishmen. I have also shown you, the characters of

the first Reformers, who the spiritual instructor of some of them was, and what strange, paradoxical, and new ideas, they advanced, and how, by forgery and lies, they contrived to palm their new-fangled religious ideas, on the minds of the people. Really, Gentlemen, was not this, a most "extraordinary and presumptuous movement," of these Reformers, and of your scriptural Church, on the *intellects* of Englishmen? I have likewise shown you, how your scriptural Church, assures her people, in her Thirty-nine Articles, that the Scriptures are the only means of their salvation; and I have also shown you, how the first Reformers and your scriptural Church, have falsified, and mutilated, those sacred volumes. On the one hand, it is declared, that the Scriptures are the *only* means of salvation, and on the other hand, it is plain, that these sacred volumes, have been falsified, and mutilated. What, then, are the people to do in this awful fix? Really, Gentlemen, is not this, another most "extraordinary and presumptuous movement" of your scriptural Church, on the *intellects* of Englishmen? I have shown you, also, with what kind of a book of Common Prayer, your Church honoured the people. I have shown you, how, *at first* it was declared, to be the work of the Holy Ghost; how then, it is declared *not* to be the work of the *Holy Ghost*, but the work of *schism*; how it is then recalled, and adopted, as a most fit means of devotion for the people. I have shown you, how artfully God's holy Word, and man's human inventions, are there mixed up together; and that, when they come in contact with each other, in what strange and paradoxical situations they place your scriptural Church. Really, Gentlemen, is not this also a most "extraordinary and presumptuous movement" of your scriptural Church, on the *intellects* of Englishmen? Our Saviour declared, that his kingdom was not of *this* world; and hence, neither he, nor his apostles, endeavoured to propagate, and support his doctrine, by force, cruelty, and persecution. But does not the above letter, and do not acts of Parliament prove, that it was by bribery among the great ones, and by force, and cruelty, and persecution, and death, on the middle and lower classes, that your scriptural Reformation was introduced, and forced on England? Really, Gentlemen,

was not this, a most "extraordinary and presumptuous movement" of your scriptural Church, on the *consciences*, and on the *intellects* of Englishmen?

Now, most Reverend Gentlemen, you and many of your reverend body, have been lately calling public meetings, in which you have unjustly endeavoured, to rouse the indignation of the people, against the Pope for making, "an extraordinary and presumptuous movement" on the Protestants of England. Now I have plainly proved, in my first address, that the Pope has *not* made an "extraordinary and presumptuous movement" on the Protestants of England; for, by the spirit of the English law, as I have shown, the Pope is *perfectly justified in all he has done*. But Gentlemen, is your Protestant Church, justified in all the "extraordinary and presumptuous movements," which, I have shown, she has been making so long on *the pockets*, and on *the intellects* of Englishmen? Certainly not. Thus you see, you have unfortunately thrown your Scriptural Church (which feeds you so well with more than nine millions a-year) into the very grave, which you have been so charitably, and officiously, unjustly digging for the poor Pope. Really, most Reverend Gentlemen, I think every one, will conclude, that this is a most extraordinary and presumptuous movement, of *you and your* reverend body, on your good, and kind mother the Church. May they not justly apply to you, the words of the old proverb, "Physicians, cure yourselves?" Most Reverend Gentlemen, to those clergymen, who have adopted the above inconsistent conduct, I can only say, I may applaud their intentions, but I must condemn their bigotry. They may indeed, be friends to their Church in their hearts, but their mouths, and pens, are her most dangerous enemies.

Before I conclude, I beg leave to say a few words about the Puseyites, a few words to the dissenters, and a few words to the English people; and then, I must drop the curtain, and beg leave to retire for the present.

There is a circumstance, connected with the Whitby meeting, upon which I have as yet made no remark. You came together, on that occasion, both ministers and people, obedient

to the trumpet call of Lord John Russell. Now, that trumpet blew two blasts, which gave "no uncertain sound." The *first*, was to denounce the papal aggression; the *second*, was to warn you of "a danger, which alarmed him (Lord John Russell) much more than any aggression of a foreign sovereign; alarmed him more, than Pope and Cardinal Archbishop, and territorial titles put together, more than the heirarchy, with all its mapping, and parcelling out of the land, nay, more to be dreaded, than an invasion of England, by the fleets and armies of any earthly power! In the name of all that is terrible, what is this danger, that is impending over us? He says that it is a danger, "*already within the gates.*" What does he mean? Why, Gentlemen, he means (and you all know it) Puseyism, and Popery, which have long been spreading, in the *very bosom* of the Protestant Church of England. Lord John proclaims to you, *this latter* danger, even more loudly than *the former*; and yet, upon *this latter* "extraordinary and presumptuous movement," you were silent at *your* meeting, *each and all*; you heard him proclaiming, that the abomination of desolation, had got possession of the holy place; and that the bewitching fascination, of the Harlot of Rome, had reduced even some of the Protestant Bishops, into dalliance with her; and yet, *not one* word, from *any* minister among you, Protestant, Independent, or Wesleyan, *not one word* either to *deny* the existence of the danger, or to propose means to *ward* it off. You *readily* flocked together, to repel the *lesser* danger, but, the *much more* alarming danger, (according to Lord John) the danger "*within the gates,*" it seemed touched you *not at all*. Really, *in this* you appear, to be worthy disciples of Lord John Russell, who sat nearly seven years, under the Rev. Mr. Bennett, with all this danger staring him in the face, and yet, blew not *then* a *single* blast of his *warning* trumpet. Really, Gentlemen, what was the cause of your silence, on this occasion? Was it lack of zeal, or lack of courage on your part? We shall, perhaps, be better able to judge of this, when I have told you, what sort of Puseyite enormities, Lord John has detected in the Church, and how, he takes upon himself, to chastise and correct them. Never, since

the days of Cromwell, the Vicar-General of Henry VIII., has any layman, or churchman either, dared to play such tricks, or brandish such a rod, in the face of the Church of England, as this imperious minister has done! Mark, how this leader of the House of Commons, this lay Metropolitan of all England, superseding both York and Canterbury, see, how he calls to account his venerable brother, the Bishop of Durham. "Clergymen of our Church, who have subscribed the thirty-nine articles, and acknowledged the Queen's supremacy, have been the most forward, to lead their flocks, step by step, to the very verge of the precipice." Well, sad shepherds these, to lead their flocks, to the very verge of the precipice, and *sadder still*, that one thousand, eight hundred of these Church of England Clergymen, have signed a protest, *against the Queen's supremacy as recently exercised*; thus rebelling, against the acknowledged, and sworn head of their Church. Well, Lord John thus describes the danger, "within the gates."

(1.) The honour paid to saints; (2.) the claim of infallibility for the Church; (3.) the superstitious use of the sign of the cross; (4.) the muttering of the liturgy, so as to disguise the language, in which it is written; (5.) the recommendation of auricular confession; (6.) the administration of penance, and (7.) absolution.

All these things, are pointed out by *certain* clergymen of the *Church of England*, as worthy of adoption! Here, according to Lord John Russell, is the "enemy within the gates." Here, are seven enormous errors, pointed out by a layman, as corrupting, and disfiguring the pure, the Scriptural, the reformed Church of England. I will make a few remarks on each, marking the number of each, as I proceed.

(1st. The honour paid to saints.) So certain Reverend Gentlemen of the Church of England, are no longer to honour the saints, as they have done; the Whig prime minister, will not permit it. But can it be, that Lord John here intimates, that these Protestant Clergymen, have been paying *divine* honour to the saints? Why, this would be idolatry! "Thou that abhorrest idols, dost thou commit sacrilege?" Catholics, indeed, honour the saints, but a true Catholic, would sooner die, than give

divine honour to any saint, or to all the saints in bliss. But, whether you Reverend Protestant Gentlemen, are to honour them at all, or with what sort of honour, or with what degree of it; all this you will learn, perhaps, from Lord John Russell, or from some of his Bishops. In the meantime, you had better observe the *Protestant* Church doctrine, as to holy angels, laid down in your *Protestant* collect, on the feast of St. Michael, where your scriptural Church, prays, that "the holy angels, may, by God's appointment, succour and defend us on earth." (Coll. of St. Mich. Ch. Eng. Prayer Book.) Surely, this doctrine of your Church of England prayer book, will not alarm Lord John Russell, and surely, the Bishop of London, will not openly reprehend this, in his next charge, to the clergy of his diocese; although, in my humble opinion, it smells very strongly of the popish doctrine of angels, and saints, and looks very like, leading the people, step by step, to the very verge of that precipice.

(2ndly. The claim of infallibility for the Church.) It seems, some of you, Reverend Gentlemen, have had the *temerity* to preach up, the infallibility of the Church. *This*, is to be "put down." You are not to claim *infallibility* for your Church. Infallibility belongs to the *Catholic* Church, which is "built upon a rock," which is the "pillar and ground of truth," "formed upon the prophets, and apostles, having Christ for its chief corner stone," with which Church Christ has promised, "to abide all days, even to the end of the world." Such is the *Catholic* Church, according to the *Scriptures*. But, as regards *your Church*, Reverend Gentlemen, you are to be diligent in teaching, that your Church is *not* infallible, is not built upon a rock, *not* founded upon the prophets and apostles,—has not Christ for its chief corner stone,—for if *she had*, she would *assuredly* be *infallible*. But above all, you are to teach, either that Christ did *not* promise, to be always with His Church, or that, even his abiding presence, with the Church, is *not* sufficient to make *her* infallible; at all events, you are to teach (if you teach anything) that *your Church*, has *no claims* to infallibility, and that she may be involved in the grossest errors, and may be altogether, misleading and deluding, both you and your flocks. This shows, what

a cuckoo cry, that was, which the vicar of Leeds, was sometime ago, sounding with *such iteration*, from the housetops, crying, "HEAR THE CHURCH." This cry, has died away, and I suspect, Dr. Hook will not *renew* it, with the return of spring. For why, in the name of common sense, should we hear, or follow the guidance of this Church of England, which does not pretend, to be a *sure* and *infallible* guide? Or where indeed, shall we find the Church? In convocation? that has been extinguished. In synod? She is not permitted to hold one. On the bench of Bishops? The Bishops, are *notoriously* at sixes and sevens, all over the land, both on matters of *faith, discipline, and ceremonies.*

Yours, Reverend Gentlemen, is a *hard* lot! I know nothing to equal to it. You glory in liberty of conscience, and are the bound slaves of a *fallible* Church, as if she were *infallible.* The Bible, and the Bible alone, is your rule of faith, and yet, you are remorselessly compelled, to subscribe to the thirty-nine Articles, which have been *added* to the Scriptures, and which are in part self-contradictory, and in part, impossible to be understood.* You exult in freedom of thought, and in the privilege of private interpretation, but if

* By the fundamental rule of Protestantism, every individual, possesses the right of private judgment, and of course, is allowed to interpret the Bible, as his reason, or his feelings, suggest; and yet, *mark* the contradiction, he is *not* allowed, to interpret the *thirty-nine Articles.* For in the declaration prefixed to this singular code, it is said: "His Majesty, prohibits his loving subjects, the least difference from them, or putting their *own* sense upon them; but requires them, to be taken in *their literal, and grammatical sense.*" Now, Dr. Paley says, that "the Thirty-nine Articles, will be found, on dissection, to contain about two hundred and forty *distinct,* and independent propositions; many of them, inconsistent with *each other.*" In fact, few of the English Clergy subscribe the articles in the literal, and grammatical sense; "and Burnet says, that in his own times, the greater part of the clergy, subscribed the Articles, *without examining them,*" and that others do it, because they *must* do it, *though they can hardly satisfy their consciences,* about some things in them. Dr. Balguy says, that "the Thirty-nine Articles impose upon us doctrines of dark, and ignorant ages." How just, then, must the observation of Gibbon be, "that the great body of the English Clergy, sign the Thirty-nine Articles, with a *sigh,* or a *smile.*" Really, to require that men, should take these Articles, in their literal, and grammatical sense, whilst many of them, have *no literal, or grammatical sense,* nay, moreover, to oblige men, to swear that they believe them, is, in my humble opinion, a violation of common sense, and of decency. In all this, there may be some degree of political wisdom, but it is surely, an act of very gross, religious inconsistency.

you *dare* to exercise *either*, you are dragged to the ecclesiastical courts, to answer for your temerity, at the bar of a Lay Judge. Ah! Reverend Gentlemen, Cranmer, and Latimer, and Ridley, did an *evil* thing; they bowed their *own* necks, and prepared for *your* necks, a galling yoke, when to rid themselves of the supremacy, of the divinely appointed head of the Church, they cried out, "we have no king but Cæsar." From *that* day to *this*, Parliament, and Parliamentary leaders, have lorded it, over your inheritance, both *spiritual* and *temporal*. You *must* either submit to *Lay* tribunals, or there are *no loaves* and *fishes* for you.

How beautifully is your Church thus described by the poet,—

"For she was of that stubborn crew
Of errant saints, whom all men grant,
To be the true Church militant:
Such as do build their faith upon,
The holy text of pike and gun;
Decide all controversies by
Infallible artillery;
And prove their doctrines orthodox
By apostolic blows and knocks;
Which always must be going on,
And still be doing, never done:
As if religion were intended,
For nothing else, but to be mended."

(3rdly. The superstitious use of the sign of the cross.) The true Catholic, knows that the Son of God, obtained the salvation of the world, by dying *on a cross*, for all mankind; and hence, like the great St. Paul, he glories in the cross of Christ, and frequently crosses himself, with this holy sign, to remind himself of Jesus Christ, who obtained so many spiritual blessings for mankind, by the great sacrifice, which he once consummated *on the cross*. Hence the Catholic Church, keeps the cross, as the sign of the pledge of our redemption, in all her churches, and chapels, and by this holy sign, reminds the faithful, that all the blessings, that they either *have* received, or *can* receive, *must* come through the *merits* of Jesus Christ. Hence, in the oblation of her holy sacrifice, in the administration of her sacraments, and in all her sacred rites, and ceremonies, she is continually using this holy sign, to remind both herself, and the

faithful, that it is by the cross, that is, by the merits of our Saviour's death, and passion, that she, and all other faithful, are to triumph over the world, the flesh, and the devil. Hence, this sign was used by antiquity with the greatest veneration. Thus, Tertullian beautifully says, "We sign ourselves with the sign of the cross, on the forehead, whenever we go from home, or return, when we put on our clothes, or our shoes, when we go to the bath, or sit down to meat, when we light our candles, when we lie down, and when we sit." But it appears, that the superstitious use of the sign of the cross, is offensive to Lord John, and, that it may lead people, step by step, to the very verge of the precipice; and therefore, you clergymen, must not make use of the sign of the cross, but you must keep the lion, and the unicorn, in *your* churches, to remind the people, that *your* church is the church of men, as by Law established. You may indeed, bow at the name of Jesus, and kiss the Bible, before you swear by it, in a court of justice, but, in the house of God, you had better omit the superstitious use of the sign of the cross, although, if *one* of the popish ceremonies be *superstitious*, it is manifest that the *other two* ceremonies, must be *also superstitious*.

(4thly. The muttering of the liturgy, so as to disguise the language, in which it is written.) Now, what this sentence really means, I am at a loss to divine; whether, it refers to the indistinct utterance, of the clergyman's enunciation, or it means, that some of these Protestant clergymen, have been performing certain parts, of the Church of England liturgy, like Catholics, in the Latin tongue, I am at a loss to determine. It is a pity, when Lord John is finding fault, about muttering, so as to disguise the language, (and of course the meaning,) of his Church liturgy, it is really a pity, Lord John did not express himself, in more intelligible terms; but, perhaps, the obscurity of Lord John's meaning, may be owing to the blunt acumen of my popish understanding. I am rather, however, inclined to think, that Lord John, is here warning his clergy, against the use of the Latin tongue, in the Church liturgy, and if so, he is perfectly right. For the English Protestant Church, is a *modern* church,

its *language*, therefore, should be *modern*, that its *liturgy*, may announce to posterity the period, in which it was formed. But the Church of Rome, is an *ancient* Church, and therefore, *she* preserves her *ancient* liturgy, the language of which, remounts to the *origin* of Christianity. I do not believe, that history, can furnish an instance of a people, who ever changed the language of their liturgy, and who did not, at the same time, change their religion. But are the Catholics of the Latin Church, singular in the use of an ancient tongue, in their service? Certainly not. The Greeks, Russians, Armenians, Syrians, Copts, Ethiopians, Georgians, and the other Christians of the East, all retain the liturgies, which they received from the fathers of their faith, and which are written in languages, unintelligible to the common people. The same, was the discipline of the Jews, after their captivity; and we do not find, that it was ever blamed by Our Saviour. But is it true, that the modern Church of England, has always held in such abhorrence, the celebration of her liturgy, in an unknown tongue? certainly not: for, in the year 1560, an act was passed, for the introduction of the English Protestant Common Prayer-Book, among the natives of Ireland, who were compelled, by the severest penalties, to assist at the celebration of the English liturgy; though these poor Irish, were *utterly* unacquainted, with the English language. Hence, Dr. Heylin, in his History of the Protestant Reformation, (Eliz. p. 128.) says, "The people, by that statute, are required under severe penalties, to frequent their churches, and to be frequent, at the reading of the *English* liturgy, which they understand, *no more* than they do the Mass." * * * "By which," continues this Protestant writer, "we have furnished the Papists, with an excellent argument against ourselves, for having the divine service celebrated in *such* a language, as the people do *not* understand."

But is the adoption of the Latin tongue, peculiar only to some of the Protestant Clergymen, of the present day? I answer no; for in the Act of Uniformity, the Protestant minister in Ireland, if he could not read the *English*, was permitted to read a *Latin* translation, which was, no doubt, equally *unin-*

telligible to the most of his parishioners. (See Dr. Heylin's Hist., as above.) In the same year, the Universities of Oxford, and Cambridge, and the Colleges of Eton, and Winchester, obtained permission from the head of their Church, to perform the divino service in the language of Rome. (Wilk. Conc. Tom. iv., p. 217.) Thus you see, that the muttering of the Liturgy, so as to disguise the language, in which it was written, is not (if I understand rightly Lord John's meaning,) is not peculiar only to some of you Protestant ministers of the present day; for it was claimed, and exercised by some of your Protestant ancestors. But then, we all know, Lord John is a consistent and straight-forward man, and therefore, he may perhaps wish you, to adopt in your Liturgy, a *modern* language, significant of the *modern* origin of your Church, and therefore, he may perhaps wish you to show, by the language of your Liturgy, that your Church, is *so many* hundred years *too late*, to be the Church of Christ.

But if the muttering of the Liturgy, &c., by the Clergy, be a great crime, is it not a far greater crime, for the Protestant Bishops, and clergymen, so to mutter the tenets of their creed, as to disguise the language, and the meaning of them, by their perpetual disunions, and contradictions? Is it not a *notorious* fact, that in *one* Protestant Church, you are taught to believe in ecclesiastical infallibility, in *another*, in the all-sufficiency of the Scriptures; in *one* Protestant parish, you have a sacrificial, mediatorial priest, in *another*, one of an opposite, and contrary opinion; in *one* Protestant Church, you have an altar, in *another*, you have a communion table; in *one* Bishop's See, the Protestant prelate *rigorously* insists, on the *necessity* of spiritual regeneration by baptism, in *another* Bishop's See, it is acknowledged to be an *unnecessary* act of religion; in Pimlico Protestant Church, you have auricular confession *insisted on*, in a Liverpool Protestant Church, you have the *punishment of death*, recommended as a *penalty* for such a practice; in short, is it not *notorious* (as I said before) that the Protestant Bishops, and Clergymen, are at sixes, and sevens, all over the land, about *their articles of faith, matters of discipline and ceremonies*? Really,

what are the people to do, amidst all this disunion, and dissension about their religion, so as to disguise, and confound the sense, and meaning of its tenets? Had not Lord John Russell, better have called his bishops, and Clergy to an account, on *this* Babel muttering of religion, before he chastised them, for the muttering of *the Liturgy*? The building of the mighty tower of Babel, was arrested, and demolished by the confusion of tongues; and be assured, most Reverend Gentlemen, unless your Scriptural Church, changes this muttering, and confusion of tongues, of her weathercock, and Babel faith, and doctrines, she must also be demolished. For does not the Scripture, plainly tell us, that "a house divided against itself, cannot stand?" and the rains (of fallibility, and of muttering the Liturgy, &c.) fell, and the floods (of clerical protestant dissensions) came, and the winds (of disunion among the bishops, about the necessity of baptismal regeneration) blew; and they beat upon that house, (the Protestant, fallible, Babel, Church,) and it fell; and great was the *golden* fall thereof, for it was built, *not* upon the rock of God's *infallible* word, but upon the mere *fallible inventions*, and *pecuniary conveniences* of men.

(5th. The recommendation of Auricular Confession, to which, I beg to add (the 7th) Absolution.)

Every well-instructed Catholic, knows that no man, *as man*, can forgive sins; but at the same time, he knows, that *God* can forgive sins, and that God, *can* give that power to *man*; for the Apostles were men, and yet, Jesus Christ (as I shall shortly shew) gave his Apostles, a power to forgive sins. You know, that our Saviour, was both God and man, and that he acted, sometimes as God, and sometimes, as man. Now, if you will read the ninth chapter of St. Matthew's Gospel, you will find, that our Saviour worked a miracle, to prove that He as man, (but mind assisted by his heavenly Father) had power to forgive sins, even on earth. Now, he gave this power, also to his Apostles, for we read in St. John's Gospel, (chap. xx. 22,) He "breathed upon them," and said, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose sins, you shall forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained." Now, why was not this

power of forgiving sins, to extend also to *future* ages? Are not God, and Jesus Christ, as good and as kind, *now*, as they were, in the *time* of the Apostles; and are there not, as many sinners *now*, as there were *then*? If therefore, God, and Jesus Christ, in their infinite mercy, gave this power of forgiving sins, to the *Apostles*, for the good of mankind then, and if there are, as many sinners *now*, as there were *then*, in the name of common sense, why was not this power of God, given to the Apostles for the benefit of mankind *then*, why was it not, to extend also to all *future* ages, for the benefit of mankind *afterwards*? No such things, cries out the Lay Metropolitan of England. Such doctrine, would lead the people, step by step, to the very verge of the precipice. But of what precipice? Would you believe it? to the recommendation of Auricular Confession, and Absolution, as laid down, in the *Church of England Prayer-book*.

In the Church of England form of Ordination, the Bishop says, to the candidate for the priesthood: "Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose sins ye shall forgive, they are forgiven, and whose sins ye shall retain, they are retained." These words, most Reverend Gentlemen, were said over each of you, by your Bishops, when you presented yourselves candidates, for ordination. Now, did you receive any spiritual power, or was this a mere form? If you answer, it was a mere form, you then have no more power, in this respect, than a mere layman; but if you answer, you did receive a power, it must have been, either a *declaratory*, or a *judicial* power to forgive sins; if it was only a *declaratory* power, viz., to declare, that the sinner, would obtain forgiveness if he truly repented, then, *any layman*, possesses this power *without ordination*; for any layman, can confidently declare, that *penitent* sinners are pardoned; but if you received a *judicial* power, to forgive sins, then, this is popish doctrine, and this would lead you, and your flock, step by step, to the very verge of the precipice. But to the verge of what precipice? Why your Protestant common prayer-book, shall now tell you. Really, most Reverend Gentlemen, I am afraid of quoting this passage, from your prayer-book; for it will not *merely lead* you to the verge, but it will *hurl* you, all headlong, down the preci-

piece of the popish doctrine, of Auricular Confession, and Absolution.

But we had better, go step by step, and therefore, I will quote a *choice piece*, that occurs in your Protestant common prayer-book, just before the recommendation of Auricular Confession, and Absolution. Your godly prayer-book, says, in the visitation of the sick, "the ministers shall not omit, earnestly to move, such sick persons, as are of ability, *to be liberal to the poor*. It is a pity, O godly Church, that thou didst not give this advice to thyself, at the Reformation, when thou stolest, so much money from the poor, and then, made the nation make up, by church-rates and poor-rates, for what thou hadst stolen. Thou art really a very disinterested spiritual physician, for thou art most solicitous about thy children, practising the virtue of *charity themselves*, but as for *thyself*, thou will practise charity, as soon as it is convenient, or as soon as the spirit moves thee, or the nation makes thee.

But what comes next, in your godly prayer-book? Why, rank, and downright Popish doctrine, of auricular confession, and absolution. In the visitation of the sick, your prayer-book thus says; "Here shall the sick person be moved to make a SPECIAL confession of *his sins*, if he feel his conscience, troubled with any weighty matter. After which *confession*, the Priest shall absolve him (if he humbly and earnestly desire it) after this sort: Our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath left power to His Church, to absolve all sinners, who truly repent, and believe in Him; of His great mercy, forgive thee thine offences: and by His authority COMMITTED TO ME, I *absolve* thee from all thy sins, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen." Really, most Reverend Gentlemen, if all this, is not rank popish, auricular confession, and absolution, I know not what is; and *mind*, standing as large as life, in *your* Church of England, Common Prayer-book, which was made by act of parliament, by "the aid of the Holy Ghost, and for the honour of God." Really, what are you, and Lord John Russell to do *now*, when your Protestant godly Prayer-book, has not only *led* you to *the verge*, but *hurled* you all headlong down to the *very*

bottom, of popish Auricular Confession, and absolution? Why, you must either renounce your Protestant prayer-book, and declare, it is *not* a work of the Holy Ghost, nor made for the honour of God; or your orthodox stomachs, must swallow, by wholesale, *this abomination of desolation*, of popish auricular confession, and absolution; and thus, allow the dreadful enemy, to remain "within your gates," an enemy more terrible than an hostile invasion by foreign powers.

(6th. The administration of Penance.) This, most Reverend Gentlemen, is the sixth error, in Lord John Russell's catalogue, of seven errors, but the last, which I have to answer, as I have already, included the seventh, in the fifth error. If Lord John, wishes to intimate, that Catholics teach works of penance, to be of *themselves* a *sufficient* compensation for sin, Lord John has yet, to learn, the *first* rudiments of the Catholic creed; but if he means, that Catholics consider the works of penance, as one of the conditions, on which our Saviour, is willing to communicate the merits of His death and passion, to the soul of the sinner, Lord John's meaning is just. But does Lord John, seriously condemn this doctrine, founded, as it is, on the plainest evidence of scripture, and confirmed by the practice of the earliest ages? If I understand Lord John rightly, he certainly does. Lord John, is perhaps the zealous champion of the all-sufficiency of Christ, and in his opinion, to do penance for sin, after the great sacrifice consummated on the cross, is to lead the people, step by step, to the verge of an awful precipice. If this, is Lord John's creed, it must, at least, be a very consoling one. Indulge your passions, it exclaims, to the sinner, indulge your passions, and cease to sin, when you can sin no longer; fear not the rigours of penance; to weep and pray, to fast and give alms, to repent in sackcloth and ashes, are external ceremonies, which are confined to the popish creed; but to practise them, in our *new* dispensation of *free* grace, *as by law established*, would be, to lead the people, to the very verge of the popish precipice. It is curious to observe, how Lord John's liberation from penance (if I understand him rightly,) has improved, on the rough sketch, which was delivered by our forefathers. St. Paul, was accus-

tomed to keep under his body, and to bring it under subjection by acts of penance; and I have no doubt, he thought he was acting in a manner, pleasing to Christ, and yet, we learn from Lord John's doctrine, (if I understand it rightly,) this great apostle, was leading the people, step by step, to the very verge, of the awful precipice of penance. The penitents in ancient times, often spent whole years in works of penance; they fasted and prayed, they lay prostrate at the porch of the Church, they solicited the intercession of their less guilty brethren. By these penitential austerities, they hoped, they were fulfilling the will of the Redeemer, and yet, alas! according to Lord John's doctrine (if I understand it rightly) they were going, step by step, to the very verge of the awful precipice of penance. Even the learned men, who compiled the Church of England, Common Prayer-book, appear to have been involved in this awful error. "There was formerly," they tell us, "a godly discipline, that at the beginning of Lent, such persons, as stood convicted of notorious sins, were put to open penance, and punished here, that their souls, might be saved at the day of the Lord; and it were much to be wished, that this said discipline, may be restored." (Church Eng. Com. Pray. book.) Little did they imagine, that this godly discipline of penance, by means of which the souls of sinners, were to be saved in the day of the Lord, would be reproved by a Protestant layman, as an error, which would lead people, step by step, to the verge of an awful precipice. Yet so (if I understand his meaning) says Lord John Russell, and he is lay Metropolitan of all England.

I think I cannot better take leave of Lord John, than by addressing him in the words of the Reverend Mr. Bennett, under whose Puseyite teaching, he sat for some time. "If my course was insidious, (Lord John), why did you take part in that course? If I so muttered the liturgy, as to disguise its language, why did *you* join in so glaring a profaneness, for nearly seven years? If I practised 'mummers and superstition,' why did *you*, come to join in them, for nearly seven years? Why did *you* so far and so deeply join, as to receive at my hands, so late as Ash Wednesday, 1849, the holy Eucharist,

yourself and your family? If I were one, of those designated in your letter, as bringing a greater danger, than the Pope, why then, my lord, was it, that *you* said not all this before?" (Rev. Mr. Bennett's Letter to Lord John Russell.)

In conclusion, I can only say, that I am afraid Lord John Russell's letter, has been a most *unfortunate one for himself*; and as such, I regret it exceedingly. It has certainly placed him, in the opinion of sensible Englishmen, in a very ridiculous point of view; and how it will be received by future ages, it is not for me to divine.

My dissenting Brethren, to you who have honourably come forward, and assisted us Catholics, in the late hurricane of bigotry, and of insults, I return you my mead of sincere thanks. Your conduct shows, that you have acted the part of consistent men, that you are true supporters of civil and religious liberty, and that you have not forgotten the former noble, and disinterested exertions of the late Daniel O'Connell, in your cause. You cannot but remember, that the late Daniel O'Connell, nobly and disinterestedly, battled for *your* rights and privileges, on the field of civil and religious liberty, *even before* he had gained those rights, either for the English Catholics, or for his dear country, poor Ireland.*

* The name of Ireland, brings to my mind, the great O'Connell, the pride of his country, the wonder of England, and the admiration of the world. When I read the direful grievances of that ill-treated nation, I wish, for the sake of England, (which I dearly love) that those grievances had never been written, either on the pages of history, or on the records of heaven. Oh, Ireland, how thou remindest me of the sufferings of my Saviour! "a man of sorrow, and the outcast of the people." Had not *his* divine example been continually before *thy eyes*, thou never couldst have endured thy load of miseries, of sorrows, and of persecution, and so nobly have proved thy loyal allegiance to thy sovereign, even amidst a deluge of insults, and of wrongs, and of injustices, that would have maddened any other nation, into a whirlwind of fury, and revenge, and rebellion; but thou rememberedst the words of thy Saviour, "love your enemies, do good to them that hate you, and persecute you." But thy days of sufferings and of sorrow are, I hope, hastening to a close; but perhaps, the time of retribution for England has yet to come. Oh, may Heaven avert this dreadful day of reckoning for my dear country! But, Oh, Ireland, I must not forget the pride of thy heart—the great O'Connell—the much-abused and calumniated Dan. He is now, indeed, beyond this land of misery; but alas, he died a beggar! Yes, *he* whom the newspapers

But what shall I say of those dissenters, who have joined with the Protestant Church, in the late fury and tirade against us Catholics? Can I call *them consistent men*? Consistent men indeed! Do not all the dissenters, the Presbyterians, Methodists, Independents, Baptists, Unitarians, and Quakers, do not all

formerly held up, as a most base knave, a deceiver, and a money-hunter, even he at last, died a beggar, for the love of his country. He nobly sacrificed his, from ten to fourteen thousand a-year, which he was making by his profession, and in lieu, accepted the comparatively small and precarious offerings of his countrymen, every farthing of which he spent in promoting their welfare; he blasted all the patrimonial prospects of his own family, and at last, died a martyr and a beggar, for his country; and yet, there is not one English Protestant newspaper to do him common justice, by even hinting at these heroic actions. Oh, how justly may I address them in the severe words of the poet:

“ You all did hate him once, but without cause,
 What cause withholds you, then, to mourn for him?
 Oh, judgment! thou art fled to brutish beasts!
 And men have lost their reason.”

But, Oh immortal Dan! their praises or censures to thee are equally worthless, for thy colossal deeds during life, and thy heroic death, have immortalized thy name. But of all thy sorrows, the *stab that burst* thy generous soul, was the “*unkindest cut of all*;” for when some of thy countrymen, whom thou hadst *raised and honoured*, wished to take into their hands the maddening weapons of injustice, revenge, and rebellion, and wished to bury thy dear country in the ruins of bloodshed and revolution, thou,

“ Then rushing out of doors, to be resolved,
 If these men so unkindly knocked, or no,
 Ingratitude, more strong than traitors’ arms,
 Quite vanquished thee, then burst thy noble heart !”

On which was engraved, in vivid characters, love for thy religion, patriotism for thy country, loyal and sincere allegiance to thy Queen, and a burning desire for civil and religious liberty for all mankind. Oh, how justly may we apply to thee, the words of the poet,

“ Thou art the ruins, of the noblest man,
 That ever lived, in the tide of times.”

I, formerly, like many other Englishmen, thought only very lightly of thy actions; but thy noble deeds convinced me of my *rash* judgment; and as some little retribution, I have paid this small tribute to thy memory. Oh, may God forgive me for my rash judgments, and may thy colossal soul rest in peace.

these dissenters deny, as well as we Catholics, the spiritual supremacy of the Queen? Nay, do not all these dissenters, claim *their* spiritual rights and authority, *independent of the Queen*? Why, therefore, will you refuse the exercise of their spiritual rights, to your *Catholic* fellow creatures? Why will you

But can I here forget "the finest Protestant (as the immortal Dan. justly observed) that Ireland ever saw?" O no! I know indeed, some will sneer at it, and call it the voice of flattery, but in the eyes of poor Ireland, it will be regarded as a just act of gratitude, to remember the liberal, the high-minded, and chivalrous nobleman, the Marquis of Normanby. When this kind hearted, and enlightened statesman, first placed his foot on the shores of Ireland, "the cauldron" (of political discords) as Lord Plunkett had said, "was boiling over, and the polemic (religious) contest was thrown in as an ingredient." But as soon as the Marquis of Normanby, hoisted in Ireland his political flag of truth, of justice, and of honour, then the cauldron (of political discord,) gradually cooled, and the polemic (religious) contest gradually subsided, into the more congenial calm of peace, of union, and of charity. Hence, might be seen the noble Marquis of Normanby, and his charitable marchioness, gracing, and gladdening by their presence the streets of Dublin, unattended by military escorts, but *safely* guarded, by the generous hearts, and faithful loyalty of a grateful people. To have touched even a single hair of their heads, or to have offered the least insult to these noble, and generous creatures, would have instantly brought down on the base offender, the indignation and fury of the people. There the noble Marquis, without any detriment to his political dignity, walked without guards, surrounded by the hearts of the people, an honour to England, a just representative of our most gracious, liberal, and well-beloved Queen, the idol of the people, and the saviour of Ireland. But why mention merely Ireland? His *whole* political career, has been a consistent course of truth, of justice, and of honour. When only young, the golden prospect of Tory promotion, the inheritance of his noble father's political influence, a seat in Parliament already obtained by a Tory constituency, were all laid before him; when lo! his penetrating though youthful mind, saw that his dear country required reform, and therefore, sacrificing all the above golden prospects, he disinterestedly ranked himself, under the banner of reform. Afterwards a sinecure, but profitable office under Government, was offered him by the Whig ministry; but his political creed, was reform and consistency, and therefore, he politely declined the tempting offer. He is afterwards honoured with the government of Jamaica, and there shews himself the sincere friend of the slave, and on one occasion, generously and manfully exposed even his own life, to vindicate and obtain their just rights: and how dearly he was there beloved, the sorrowful and sincere lamentations, that bade him the last farewell, can best tell. He is honoured also, with the government of Ireland, and gradually peace, contentment, and union, begun to smile on that long agitated, and mis-ruled land. But in all his political promotions, to his honour be it remembered, that he never solicits nor asks of Government any places of office

unjustly deprive *them* of those privileges, which are the *birth-right* of *every* Englishman ; nay, of every human creature in the world ? Does not the scripture, which you so often extol, tell you, “ that you ought not to do unto others, that which you do not wish others to do unto you ? ” What, then, are we to say of those dissenting ministers, or minister, who on one day are seen claiming the power to give spiritual ordination to others, then, shortly after, attending an Anti-Protestant Church meeting ; and, lastly, see them or him, arranged by the side of the *Protestant* Church, for the express purpose, of refusing to the *Catholic* Church, the exercise of those spiritual rights, which they, or he, had not long before deemed it their, or his right to assume ? Nay, what is still worse, he had *even* wished to refuse them the rights of a base criminal, viz., that a charitable dissenter should not be allowed to speak, or merely ask a question, in defence of the Pope, and of the benighted papists. Really, was not *this*, a most inconsistent, “ extraordinary and presumptuous movement,” of this dissenting minister ? Well, I can only say, if the *religious* creed of this minister, be not *more consistent* than his *political* creed, I really envy him not the possession of it, and I think I cannot do better, than address him in the words of the poet :

“ His notions fitted things so well
That, which was which, he could not tell,
But oftentimes, mistook the one
For t’other, as great clerks have done.”

I must now say a few words to the English, in general, and make a few remarks on the unjust manner, in which the Catholic religion, has in general been hitherto, treated and abused. That you may the better understand this, I will make use of the

for his relations. Such has been the consistent and even tenor of his political career. Long, will the name of Normanby, be dearly cherished, in the heart of every sincere Catholic, of every grateful Irishman, and of every true English reformer ; and he will be handed down to posterity, as a worthy descendant of the Mulgrave family, whose character has always been distinguished, for their acts of justice, liberality, and charity to all, *without any distinction of religious creeds*. Well then might the immortal Dan declare, that “ The Marquis of Normanby, was the finest Protestant, that Ireland ever saw.”

following supposition. Let us suppose, for a moment, that we were in a court of justice, that a person was going to be tried, that some of you were witnesses against him, that the rest of you, were to form the jury, and that I was to be the judge. Now, if we were to examine, *only* the witnesses who were *against* the accused, and *not* allow a *single* individual to speak for him, if we were not, to allow the poor man to speak a word in his *own* defence, and were the jury, and the judge, then to pronounce him guilty, do you think, we should treat that man *fairly*? *However innocent* he might be, he was sure to be brought in *guilty*. And why? Because the witnesses were against him, the jury was against him, and the judge was against him; and not a single word was allowed to be spoken in his defence. Now, ye honest men of England, would you not think that man was treated very *unfairly*? Would you not feel for such a man? And would you not pity his case? I am sure you would, and all with one voice exclaim, "Let the poor man have *fair play*, and let us 'do to *him*, as *we* would be done by.' "

Now, my friends, let us apply this example, to the Catholic religion. Have you not read books, that gave you the most horrible account of the Catholic religion, have you not heard people, tell the most infamous things against this religion, and have you not, *even* in places of *worship*, heard this religion, most *cruelly* called, and abused? But did you ever ask yourselves, whether all that you then read or heard, was *really* true? Did you consider, that abuse, is no argument, declamation, no evidence, accusation, no verdict? Did you examine the witnesses on the *other* side? Did you read any *Catholic* book, or consult any well-instructed *Catholic* layman, or minister on these subjects? Did you not condemn the poor Catholics, *unheard*, and without giving them a *fair* trial? But mind, I am not blaming *you*, nor the *public in general*, for this ignorance of our religion, nor am I surprised at it. No, considering what has been the state of things, I cannot conceive how it could have been otherwise. For these misrepresentations, and false statements against our religion, have been often made by very *respectable* persons, and often repeated to the people, either from *the pulpit*, where

nothing but the *truth*, should be spoken, or in tracts, and books, which either *are*, or *profess to be* written by *learned* and *sincere* members of society. Thus hearing these statements, and accusations, from *these* sources, the people very natural enough conclude, that all that is said against the poor *benighted* Papists, *must be true*. But my friends, I beg of you that *in future*, you will always remember, that the law of England, strictly forbids any one, even the *basest criminal*, to be condemned *before*, he has had a *fair* trial, that it is an excellent maxim in life, “hear *both* sides *before* you *judge*,” and the Scripture expressly says: “Thou shalt not bear *false* witness against *thy* neighbour.” Why should not then the *same* principles, be adopted in *judging* of the *Catholic* religion? When then, in future you hear any abuse, or accusation against the Catholic religion, I beg of you to ask yourselves two questions: *First*, am I certain that the *Catholic* Church maintains *such* doctrine? and *secondly*, if it does, have I heard the *proofs*, which may be advanced, in *confirmation* of that doctrine? Oh! would only all Englishmen, grant the Catholics this common boon of justice! how soon would that dark, and heavy cloud of prejudice and misrepresentation, which has so long hung over our religion, immediately burst, and as the sun, after having been shrouded in clouded majesty, amidst the terrific storm, bursts forth with more transcendent brightness, so would the Catholic faith, after having been so long darkened with the mist of false representation, burst forth, with a lustre and brightness, which could not help attracting the eye of every sensible, and thinking mind.

One or two more remarks to you Englishmen, and then, I really must for the present bid you farewell. You cannot be ignorant of the many Protestant clergyman, who, are either returning in *many* respects to the Catholic faith, or who have *already*, *publicly* renounced the *Protestant*, and embraced the *Catholic* faith. Now, with all these venerable examples before you, ought not you *laity*, to begin to think, that you *also*, have a right, nay, that it is *your duty*, to examine how religious affairs, stand in England? You cannot read, without feelings of interest, and surprise, the account of the *numerous* conversions,

of these *Protestant* clergymen, to the *ancient Catholic*. Although you may condemn the change, still you cannot but admire the singleness of their purpose, and the strength of their minds. The Catholic Church, has no *earthly* treasures (for the Protestant Church got all these long since) to offer these ministers for the great sacrifice of wealth, of friendship, and other worldly interests, which they have to forfeit, for *renouncing* the *Protestant*, and *embracing* the *Catholic* faith. On the other hand, your rich, but poor in spirit Church, lays before them *golden* prospects, some of the best, and highest preferments of your Church. But, they have turned their backs upon them all, either to accept the lowly charge of a Catholic Priest, or to sink into some despised, and humble situation in life. To many of you, these sacrifices may appear folly; but remember these converts, have lately studied in the school of St. Paul, who "suffered the loss of all things, and accounted them as dung, that he might gain Christ." (Phil. iii.) Thus, they have cheerfully renounced the riches, and honours of this world, to associate themselves in faith, and worship, with those holy, and illustrious members of the Catholic faith, who, in every age, and clime, have made it their aim, and glory, to bring their dear, but erring brethren, to this one fold, of the one Shepherd, Jesus Christ.

I can only say it appears to me strange, passing strange, that if Catholicity be such a monster, as some would gladly persuade the world, it appears very strange, that there should be such an inclination in England, of late years, to return to this ancient faith. Every one must acknowledge, that the march of intellect in England, during these late years, has been immense; but if Catholicity be such a monster, as our enemies *charitably* represent it, what is the reason, so many are beginning to enter into its fold, and what is the reason, Catholicity in England is so much in the increase? This great increase, is acknowledged even by our enemies. One would *reasonably* think, that if Catholicity be such a monster, the march of intellect would have *naturally* guarded the people against it. It surely will not be said, that the people have not been sufficiently warned against it. What! not sufficiently

warned against it! Have they not been warned against it, these three hundred years at least? Have they not been warned against it, in books of all descriptions, from the large folio to the penny tract? Have they not been warned against it, in almost every pulpit (except Catholic) in England? Have they not been warned against it, again, and again, in the House of Lords and Commons? Have they not been warned against it, in almost every rank of society? In short, have they not been warned against it by every means, that human ingenuity could devise? But surely, we shall not be told, that this inclination to Catholicity, is owing to the want of scriptural knowledge in England? Want of scriptural knowledge indeed in England! Have not millions of money, been subscribed for the printing of the scriptures, have not millions of bibles, been printed and circulated in England? In short has not almost every one a bible, to which he confidently appeals as his word of life? And yet notwithstanding all this *warning* against Catholicity, notwithstanding this immense diffusion of bibles in England, Catholicity is rapidly increasing, to the great dismay and "horriification" of our enemies. What then, can be the reason of this late increase of Catholicity in England? Why, I will tell you, the people of England, can now most of them read, and the march of intellect is abroad, and by these means the people begin to find out, that their Catholic fellow creatures, have been long, an unjustly abused, a shamefully treated, and basely calumniated body of Christians. The people, therefore, naturally begin to feel for them, and are now unwilling to be deceived, by the idle rant of those misinformed, but positive writers and preachers, who

" Without the care of knowing right from wrong,
 Always appear, decisive, clear, and strong,
 Where others, toil with philosophic force,
 Their nimble nonsense, takes a shorter course,
 Flings at your head, conviction in a lump,
 And gains remote conclusions at a jump."

It is related in the Anglo-Saxon history, that when the Catholic missionaries came from abroad, to announce the truths of

the Gospel to our pagan Anglo-Saxon ancestors, it is related that an aged and venerable, but unconverted Thane thus addressed his pagan prince on the subject. "When," said he, "O King, you and your ministers are seated at table in the depth of winter, and the cheerful fire blazes on the hearth in the middle of the hall, a sparrow perhaps, chased by the wind and snow, enters at one door of the apartment, and escapes by the other. During the moment of its passage, it enjoys the warmth; when it is once departed, it is seen no more. Such is the nature of man. During a few years his existence is visible: but what has preceded, or what will follow it, is concealed from the view of mortals. If the new religion, offer any information on subjects so mysterious and important, it must be worthy of our attention." (Ling. His. Anglo-Sax. vol. i. pp. 29—30.) Happy shall I consider myself, O Englishmen, if in the above pages, I have advanced anything, that may be thought worthy of your attention on the subject of religion. Our lives, as this pagan, but aged and venerable Thane justly observes, are beautifully pictured by the short flight of a sparrow, flying through the narrow space of a hall, with a door open at each end. But after this short passage of life, there is something most awful, and mysterious awaiting us, and the true religion of God, only can unfold to us, how we may best prepare ourselves for the revelation of those awful moments, when time shall end, and eternity begin. Surely then, the sincere search after the true religion, must be a subject worthy of your information, of your attention, and of your frequent consideration. Happy, again I repeat it, shall I consider myself, if anything that I may have said, shall tend to assist you in the above important, and essential investigation. Refer, however, the glory and honour, not to me, but to the holy Catholic Church, under whose guidance I have been instructed. O holy Church, the pillar of truth and the child of Jesus Christ, if I stray from thine unerring word, I shall soon (a weak and frail child of Adam) fall down the awful precipice of spiritual inconsistencies, contradictions, and errors. Should I have advanced anything contrary to any article of thy holy faith, I am ready publicly to recall it. Under the safe shelter of thy

unerring authority, I will fix my resting-place, and there, fear neither the scoffs of the infidel, nor the flimsy reasoning of those, who have unfortunately strayed from thy secure paths. O Englishmen, if you would only seriously, and conscientiously examine the *real* merits of the Catholic Church, you would soon find that she is built upon the pillar of truth, and that she is the admirable work of that wise builder, Jesus Christ, who built His house upon a firm foundation. "And the rains fell, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and they beat on that house, but it fell not, for it was founded upon a rock." (St. Matt. vii, 25.)

ERRATA.

FIRST ADDRESS.

Page 1, line 23, for "rights" read "rites."
8, note line 6, for "Gospels" read "Gospel."

